
THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

APRIL, 1868.

ART. I.—THE LATE EDITOR.

Rev. HENRY HARBAUGH, D. D., the late lamented Editor of the MERCERSBURG REVIEW, died at his residence in Mercersburg on the 28th December, 1867, aged fifty years and two months. This sad event has already been announced, amid tokens of grief and sorrow, throughout the Church. Still, owing to the relation the deceased sustained to the REVIEW, it is proper that it should be announced in these pages, accompanied with such poor words as we may be able to pen as a tribute to his memory.

At the request of the publishers, we superintended the getting up of the January number while Dr. Harbaugh was lying upon a bed of sickness. When the matter for that number was all sent in, we considered our work done. It was expected to be issued promptly on the first of the year, but some difficulty arising in arranging the forms, and the consequent necessity of procuring some new pages of matter, prevented its appearance until about a month later. Meantime Dr. Harbaugh was called away by death from his earthly labors. This will explain, what may have seemed strange to some, why no notice of his death appeared in the last number of the REVIEW.

In accepting the editorship of the MERCERSBURG REVIEW a little more than a year ago, Dr. Harbaugh brought to the work such reputation as a writer, and such interest in the system of philosophical and theological thought it was intended to represent, as gave assurance that its old reputation would be fully sustained. He had been a regular contributor to its pages from the commencement of its publication in 1849. At that time, when but *thirty-one* years of age, he had already published his first work, *The Sainted Dead*, a highly favorable notice of which appeared in the first volume of the REVIEW. "Mr. Harbaugh," says the Reviewer, "is constitutionally a thinker, and not a mere dull retailer of other men's thoughts. The habits of the preacher and pastor, both vocations in which he is known to excel, are not allowed with him to mar the sympathies and affinities of the scholar; and the present production, in this view, is certainly very creditable to his literary character and powers, and carries in it also good augury for the time to come." This expectation was more than realized in his subsequent career.

His first article in the REVIEW was on *Reverence in Worship*, in which may be discerned already the easy flow of his pen, his chaste style, as well as the deep, spiritual tendency of his thinking. From that time on, though not so frequently during the first years, probably because of his labors in preparing the second and third volumes of his work on *The Future State*, he appeared from time to time as a contributor, until the publication of the REVIEW was suspended in 1861. These years cover a most important period in the history of the German Reformed Church in this country. Those who have lived through them in its communion, know something of the struggle through which the Church passed during this period, in maintaining its churchly position over against the unchurchly spirit that prevailed so generally in the American Protestant Churches. It was a struggle which seemed to test, for the theological thinking of the Reformed Church, to its utmost, the claims of Protestantism, in the midst of its rationalistic and disintegrating ten-

dencies then so powerfully active. Those who can sit down quietly and unconcerned, who can see even now no cause for serious concern in the present posture of the Church, who drink in and dole out theology as all settled and fixed for all time, who take their private judgment of the Bible as their infallible guide, who make no account of the Creed and the history of the Church in its formative, classic period, who in short do not believe in the Church as an objective order of grace, may wonder what all this struggle was about. Not so with the ministry of the Reformed Church. They made solemn earnest with the Church Question, and they came out of the struggle with a baptism as of fire, by which they became settled and confirmed in their faith in the one holy Catholic Church. Dr. Harbaugh continued during this period in full and hearty sympathy with the system of thought held and taught in our institutions at Mercersburg. It found a response in the depths and earnestness of his religious life. He grew with its growth, and thus became one of its ablest defenders.

Meantime he had gone forward in his career as an author. His three volumes on *The Future State* were followed from time to time by his Life of Schlatter, The Fathers of the Reformed Church, 2 vols., The True Glory of Woman, a volume of Poems, The Birds of the Bible, The Golden Censer, Union with the Church, a Child's Catechism, Hymns and Chants, Youth in Earnest, besides editing during all this time a monthly, *THE GUARDIAN* and contributing to various periodicals and Reviews. And all this, too, while attending to the onerous duties of a pastoral charge.

In the year 1863 he was called to the chair of Systematic and Practical Theology in the Theological Seminary at Mercersburg. He returned to the institution in which he was educated enriched with valuable experience and varied learning. The energies of his active and laborious life were now concentrated in the new work to which he was called. Theology had been the study of his life, and theology, too, not in the old and worn-out moulds of thought, but as struggling after such new

enunciations as the progress of the Church demands. He seemed now to have settled down to the crowning work of his life. The theology which he had learned in early life from his venerable preceptor, Dr. Nevin, had become fully his own, and enriched by extensive reading and faithful study of German theologians. He now set about his new work with earnestness and industry. To systematize his own theological thinking, to travel over the whole field of theological science, to present each subject with that care and precision, the necessity of which only a teacher can realize, as he is confronted with earnest, intelligent, inquiring young men, whose preparation for the holy ministry he is to superintend, this was the great work to which he now devoted his time and energies. The extensive manuscripts he has left behind are witness of the un-wearied faithfulness and diligence with which he prosecuted his labors. It may be interesting to his many friends to give a brief synopsis of these lectures. First, there is a full course of *lectures on Dogmatics*. This, of course, was the main, central study in his department. He had fully wrought out his own system, according to the Christological principle. Although he had selected *Lange* as his favorite author, yet his lectures give abundant evidence, that he did not rest satisfied with merely retailing other men's thoughts. During the last year of his residence at Mercersburg, he had commenced a careful review of these lectures, re-writing, modifying and improving. Judging from the work as far as thus completed, it is not too much to say that if he had lived to finish it, he would have produced a system of Christological Theology which would have gone far beyond any thing yet given to the public in this department in this country. The most difficult part of his work here consisted in settling upon his method, particularly with reference to the first part, the beginnings of any science, as all know, being by far the most difficult. The difficulty here was to make the Christological principle rule scientifically the very first inquiries in reference to the Being of God. This we think he did successfully. His system starts with the Consciousness of

God in man, which consciousness is of course in accordance with the image of God stamped in our being. It is a consciousness of God as He is related to man, and as He reveals Himself to man in the God-man. Thus we have the knowledge of God in Christ; or, we may say, The Father in the Creed is the Father in Christ—as Christ is the centre of the Creeds, so He is the centre of all theology. We give the headings of these opening lectures :

1. The Consciousness of God. 2. The Knowledge of God. 3. The Ground of the Knowledge of God. 4. The Development of the Consciousness of God. 5. The Genesis of the Knowledge of God. 6. The Eternal God-man. Then follows The Trinity, (a) Trinity in Unity, (b) Unity in Trinity (the ontological and economic Trinity), then The Essential Determinations in the Being of God (attributes), next Creation, The World as Cosmos, The World as *Æon*, &c., &c.

Next we have a course of Lectures on Practical Theology, on Catechetics, Cultus, and The Pastoral Work. Lectures on Homiletics, on Symbolics, on The History of Reformed Dogmatics, and on The Heidelberg Catechism. Of course but a poor idea can be conveyed by any such meagre outline, but it will suffice to show somewhat the amount of work performed. In a Seminary where the teaching is all done by two professors and a tutor, the wonder is where time could be found for such an amount of labor, amounting really to the preparation of full Treatises in the several departments above enumerated. The Church knows the labor he performed besides, preaching regularly in his turn in the Seminary Chapel, furnishing contributions regularly for the *Messenger*, serving on committees, &c., &c. No wonder his locks were rapidly turning white. Yet he was in the prime of life, full of youthful vigor, and prepared for many years of labor in the Church.

He seemed peculiarly fitted now for the work of editing the REVIEW, which was called for from all quarters in the Church. His theological studies conducted him into the very centre of the sphere in which it proposed to move. Not for the purpose

merely of having a Quarterly to represent us as a Church among the theological Quarterlies, was the MERCERSBURG REVIEW called for, and its re-issue commenced. It was generally felt that it had a special mission to fulfill. The important problems growing out of the *Church Question*, which it had earnestly discussed years ago, were still waiting for solution. Interest in them was being revived outside our own denomination, and the times seemed propitious for presenting them anew to the consideration of the theological public. Our own ministry needed an organ for their theological interest and culture. Theology is discussed in other Quarterlies, ably and well, but not just after the manner in which the ministry in our Church are accustomed to discuss it.

Accordingly Dr. Harbaugh undertook the work of starting the REVIEW. It was to be a legitimate continuation of the old MERCERSBURG REVIEW, and accordingly it assumed the old familiar title, by which it had become known and endeared to us as a denomination. The old contributors came to its aid, among whom was one, whose name will suggest itself, whose contributions had given wide reputation to the old REVIEW, besides new ones of admitted ability; and it moved forward with the old tone and vigor, giving fair promise of a healthy life and a long and useful career. The first year of its publication came to a close, and on the last day of the year the mortal remains of its beloved and worthy editor were borne to the grave. His work on earth was done, and well done, and the Master called him to his reward.

A suitable record of the life and labors of Dr. Harbaugh has been presented elsewhere. We shall merely add to this brief sketch, some impressions which we have received from our intimate acquaintance and association with him, especially during the last few years of his life, which will doubtless meet a response in the minds and hearts of many others, who were attached to him in warm and devoted friendship.

The first feature of his life that rises up before us now is its *originality*. From beginning to end, it had peculiarly a type

of its own. This appears already in his first leaving the old homestead to seek his proper calling in life. His own nearest friends were not able, at the time, to understand why he should forsake the ordinary beaten track to seek some new career, and it was attributed to a changeable, wandering disposition, which would only end in disappointment. Perhaps his course was not clear in his own mind. He felt the stirrings of aspirations which only served at first to launch him out into the world. But, once started on the journey, these aspirations became clearer to his own consciousness, and it was not long before he earnestly set about preparing himself for that highest and holiest of all callings, the work of the Christian ministry. In a short time, by his own industry, he had prepared himself for a course of study in the College and Seminary, and now he returns from what was then called the West to the Institutions at Mercersburg, near his home, and enters upon the immediate preparation for the work of his life. Though starting with less than ordinary advantages of intellectual culture, he felt within him an impulse to a career which should be in no sense a mere copy of any other life. His sermons were always fresh and interesting, because they always presented some points or features which were original in the sense we have indicated. He became an author, and his books bore the same impress. He started a magazine, and infused into it his own peculiar life and spirit. He opened a career for himself, and pursued it with undeviating energy successfully to its goal.

Every one born into the world is endowed with the germ of an individuality, which is as unlike every other, as the expression of every one's countenance differs from every other in the world. Every individual, while he is an expression of the life of the race, is, in a deep sense, a new thought of God. Dr. Harbaugh was true to himself in this respect. In all his habits and manners he impressed those who came into his company with a sense of his naturalness. Of course, his more than ordinary talent, and varied attainments, gave strength and interest to this feature in his life, but there was something back of these,

which stamped every thing he uttered and did as peculiarly his own.

Call this originality, when thus strongly marked, genius, if you will. To it was owing largely the lasting impression which he has made upon the Church in which he labored, and the world of letters where he became extensively known. To it was owing likewise the warm bosom of friendship which he created wherever he became intimately known. His character in this respect was truly childlike, expressing in every word and act what he was. Life was too earnest and solemn, and his own individuality was too sacred, for him in any way to act merely a part. This may do for the stage, where characters change with the changing scenes; but it will not do for that life which is to be lived but once, whose issues are in the unchanging eternity.

He had a strong aversion and antipathy to any thing that looked like sham in any department of life. The readers of his magazine will recall the humorous severity with which he laid bare and rebuked, in a series of articles, a class of deceptions and impositions in the world, which have obtained the characteristic title, *humbug*. One of the greatest merits of the *Guardian* has been that it presents life to the young as real, presents it in its natural coloring, and dissipates that unreal and false coloring which is so generally thrown around it, especially by the light literature of our day.

This trait was marked also in Dr. Harbaugh's religious life. Here especially he felt that man ought to be true to himself. Religion is supernatural, but it is also natural. In each one it must speak in a natural voice which is true to the inward life. Hence religious cant was his aversion. An assumed tone or habit of piety called forth his strongest antipathy. He held it up often in the most withering exposure. For doing this, he was sometimes charged with making light of sacred things. It was his deep reverence for sacred things, for true piety, which led him to speak rebukingly of all kinds of sham in religion.

Another leading characteristic of Dr. Harbaugh was his

strong convictions and his strong faith. What to his mind and heart was true and right, drew out towards it his deepest sympathies, and that which stood arrayed against it called forth a deep-seated opposition. The question did not present itself so much in the sphere of intellect, a reasoning upon right and wrong, but it became to him a question of spirits, true or false, good or bad, and his deep-toned spiritual nature rose in hearty sympathy or hearty opposition. His nature has been truly characterized, in a beautiful tribute from a warm friend, in this respect, as being *ardent*. When he embraced a cause, he embraced it with his whole heart, and when he opposed a wrong, he set all the energies of his nature against it.

So, also, he had a calm, strong faith in the right, which gave a hopefulness to his disposition, and went far to infuse the same feeling in others. Of course all who believe in Christ and His religion, have faith also in its ultimate success and triumph; but how often the wisest and best are thrown into doubts and fears as to the immediate success of the truth in the world. And men of different temperaments are differently affected by the immediate prospects that present themselves to view. Few can resist the feeling of despondency, when unrighteousness triumphs and the cause of justice is trampled in the dust. Dr. Harbaugh was not an optimist. He did not sympathize with humanitarian views of the progress of society and the world. Success of the right, and progress in man's true interests, can only be reached in Christianity. The world rejects Christianity so far as it remains *this world*, and must move on in its own sphere to destruction. But in this perishing of the old, there arise continually new triumphs of the new life that has come into the world. To this Dr. Harbaugh hopefully looked, and while the struggle was going on, he was steadily looking for the victory. During the late war he was always hopeful while others desponded. When the enemy came in upon us like a flood, and men's hearts were failing them for fear, when Gen. Lee was leading his formidable hosts into the heart of Pennsylvania, when towns were thrown into panics, he met every ex-

pression of fear and doubt by the one question, "Have you heard from the Army of the Potomac? Wait till you hear where it is." In the struggles through which the Church is called to pass, he was calmly hopeful. Though the present might be dark with clouds and storms, he waited calmly for the coming sunshine. That must come after every storm, for storms are only temporary, but the sun shines ever. The gift of such a spirit in these times is of priceless value. In the tendencies of the times there is much to shake the faith of the wisest and best, not in the ultimate triumph of Christianity—that for the Christian is placed beyond all doubt—but in the success of particular forms of our common Christianity, in which we feel deeply interested. Such a form of Christianity is the divided condition of Protestantism. It must surmount its present weakness in some way, but how faint and few are the signs of the better state of *unity*.

What is true of Protestantism as a whole, that it is passing through a critical period of transition, is true also of particular denominations. These but reproduce the life and struggles of the whole. Hence in nearly every one of them may be witnessed counter tendencies struggling for the victory. Out of these sore travailings will come forth, in every one that is to be conserved, a true and safe deliverance from the bondage of sect and schism.

In the Reformed Church this struggle between counter tendencies has been felt for years, and is still going on. Dr. Harbaugh wielded a strong arm in support of the tendencies of a Catholic Christianity among us, and his strength rested in a strong conviction and faith, that in this struggle the old faith of the Creed will continue to stand against all its foes. He had strong confidence in the people of the Reformed Church. Their deepest religious instincts and tendencies, he believed, are of a churchly character. They may be confused and led astray for a time by another gospel, but when they see and understand the old, they will cling to it. How absurd, for instance, to expect that a German people, educated as ours have been, should re-

ject the conception of *sacramental grace*, give up the belief in a *tauf-gnade*, and embrace the Puritan scheme of the Gospel of Christ! This, Dr. Harbaugh strongly felt would be absurd, and therefore his conviction was strong that the people, the more they came to understand the issue, would rally to the churchly side in our present controversies. Only where they have become Puritanized can they lean to the other side. They are averse to changes because they love the old, and therefore they hesitate to endorse a change, even from a foreign order of worship which has imperceptibly stolen in upon us, to the old, but to be prepared for this they need only to learn that it is really a return to the ancient landmarks. That he interpreted rightly the religious instincts of our people, is made evident by the turn, which the question has taken at every critical juncture in our recent history. That he was right in his strong convictions on the subject of the Liturgy will, we believe, be fully shown by the future history of our Church. The people will not, in the end, sell their precious birthright for a foreign order of church-life and worship.

Dr. Harbaugh possessed, to a remarkable extent, what the Germans call *Gemüthlichkeit*—a word which it is difficult to translate. “Kindly disposition,” “good nature,” “heartiness,” “tenderness of mind,” all come short of expressing it fully. It was a quality in him which all could feel who became acquainted with him. It brought him very near to the hearts of his friends. It gave life and spirit to every circle which he entered. From this, too, flowed constantly a fund of rich humor. So deeply was this an element of his nature, that he carried it with him even through the days of his last protracted sickness. From his warm, hearty disposition, went forth a spiritual power which made sunshine in his sick chamber. His piety was of the deep, German type. It was never of the Puritan stamp. Never morose or gloomy, but always cheerful and hopeful. He greeted his friends who approached his bedside with the old familiar names, generally using the Christian name, as he gave them the warm grasp of his hand. Amidst

all the wanderings of his mind, his deep, German life and piety showed themselves to the last. By reason of the shadow that gradually gathered over his consciousness, through the affection of his brain, he could not clearly enunciate his feelings and convictions as he approached through much suffering the rest and peace of the heavenly world. His only desire to recover was that he might continue here to labor for the Church. Beyond this he had no wish to live. "No wonder," he said, on awaking once from what seemed an unconscious stupor, "that the early Church saw the blood of the atonement even on the leaves of the trees." At another time, when roused from such a state, he said to a friend, "They have called me back from the golden gates." During intervals of consciousness he spoke with calmness of his approaching end. Not many days before his death he remarked to the young friend who nursed him, "Some of these afternoons I will take my departure." When asked what he meant, he explained, that he would depart to the other world. His words were fulfilled. On an afternoon, the last of the week, as the day began to merge into the shades of evening, he peacefully slept in Jesus. It was the good man's Saturday night. The weary work of life was done, the toil was ended, and he rested from his labors to enter upon the enjoyment of the eternal Sabbath.

During the last few years of Dr. Harbaugh's life, we lived in the most intimate friendship and almost daily intercourse with him. We knew and sympathized with his views and aims in starting the REVIEW. We know the contributors to whom he looked for articles, and merely applied to them in filling out for him the work of the first year. And now, called unexpectedly to continue this work for another year, we propose to do what we can to advance the important interest with which we have been brought into this more intimate relation.

Under such circumstances, no lengthy introduction seems to be called for at our hands, in assuming for the present the edi-

torial management of the REVIEW. A single year could hardly be expected to produce much change in the general purposes it seeks to subserve. And yet that brief period has served, to no inconsiderable extent, to reveal more clearly and fully the important mission upon which it has entered. It is idle to attempt to conceal the fact, that our Protestant Christianity is engaged in a struggle, which vitally concerns its very existence. The strife is not about mere words, but in reference to the very essence of Christianity. Is it, or is it not, a real supernatural order of grace and heavenly powers in the world? Does it reach down in unbroken succession from the historical Christ and His Apostles, in a truly historical form, with an objective constitution of its own in the Holy Catholic Church, and as such challenge the faith and submission of men? Or is it mere subjective experience, a matter of private interest between each man and his Maker?

It is not difficult to see that the call of Protestantism is something more than merely to confront and expose the errors of Rome. If it is to stand, it must make good its claims to being a positive power, over against the new assaults of rationalism and infidelity which are directed against it. These assaults are made under more specious and dangerous forms than ever confronted the Church before, in proportion as the powers of darkness develop towards their final doom. And it cannot be concealed either, that the most dangerous foe of the Church is precisely that which rises in her own bosom. The anti-Christ ever seeks to stand in the temple of God, to be worshipped as God. Hence the disposition in our day to array Christianity against itself. The struggle is mainly within our own camp. Men seek to array the mystical Christ against the historical Christ. The historical Christ is made to be a myth, under the plea of honoring the Christ who is mystically, or ideally only, present in the minds and hearts of men. Thus would such men as Strauss and Renan undermine the historical foundations of Christianity, in order to place before us a phantom for our Lord and King.

Over against all such assaults of rationalism, it remains for

Protestantism, as the purest and best form of Christianity in the world, to make good its claims upon the faith and obedience of men. What are its provisions and preparations to do this? The endless diversity of its creeds and forms of organization is at once a confession of its weakness. This is coming to be felt more and more year by year. It is no longer considered an advantage that the Protestant Church is unable to present a united front to the assaults of its enemies. Churches are casting about for plans of union. They are seeking, often blindly it is true, for a centre of unity. The movements in this direction during the past year are ominous. They reveal a growing sense of weakness, while at the same time but little has been gained of a really substantial character to satisfy this want. But even this sense of want may be taken as one of the hopeful signs of the times.

The MERCERSBURG REVIEW has a word to utter on the issues thus more and more clearly confronting the Protestant Church. It seeks to labor earnestly for Protestantism, with full faith in its divine call and mission, but with a lively sense also of its weaknesses, imperfections, and dangers.

During the last year there has also been developed more fully a contest within the bosom of our own denomination, corresponding in many of its features with the strife between genuine and spurious Protestantism without. The REVIEW aims to be the *organ*, not of a party or a school, as is sometimes charged against it, but of the *Church*. It plants itself firmly, first of all, upon the Apostles' Creed, and seeks to interpret and measure modern confessions by that symbol. In this full justice is done to the Reformers, and the great interest of the Reformation. The Reformation never professed nor pretended to be of like authority with the Apostolic Church, whose faith came to its catholic expression in the Apostles' Creed. The Reformers never designed to set aside the proper authority of the Creed and the early Church. To these they constantly appealed, and, as in the case of the Heidelberg Catechism, they made the

Creed to be still the authoritative expression of our Catholic Christian faith.

The Reformation comes before us thus as a most important epoch indeed, but not of like authority with the Apostolic Church, nor one that in any way sets aside the meaning and authority of that period which immediately succeeded the Apostolic times. As Protestants we have a patrimony in Early Christianity. We also must use the freedom guaranteed us by the Reformation itself, to strive after a higher and better position than we now occupy. The Reformers can never become our popes. The three centuries which have unfolded the contents of the Reformation must form the womb for the birth of a new epoch. To the dawn of a new era, all who make earnest with the present struggles in the Church look with faith and hope.

It only remains to add, that in assuming the editorial management of the REVIEW, we expect to serve those who are especially interested in its publication to the best of our ability. We look confidently to its friends for hearty support. It is to be seen whether the Church will sustain it in such a way as to guarantee its permanent success.

ART. II.—HOLY BAPTISM.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE REFORMED CHURCH.

BY E. V. GERMARY, D. D., LANCASTER, PA.

We propose to institute an inquiry into the doctrine concerning Holy Baptism as held and taught by the Reformed Church.

We do not mean the Reformed Church of Germany, or the German Reformed Church, particularly. Nor do we mean the doctrine of the entire Protestant Church, which would include Lutheranism. We intend to limit our inquiry to the Reformed branch of Protestantism. Within this limit, however, we propose to survey the whole field; which will embrace the Reformed Church of Switzerland, of France, of Germany, of Holland, of Belgium, of Bohemia, of Poland, of England or the Anglican Church, and the Reformed Church of Scotland, or the Presbyterian Church of Scotland and Ireland, and its various subdivisions in America.

To determine this question in a satisfactory manner, it is necessary to go to the most trustworthy sources of information. These may be divided into three classes: 1. The works of the leading theological Professors and divines of the different branches of the Reformed Church, who are to be regarded as the representatives of the Reformation period, and the exponents of the Reformed faith; 2, the various Liturgies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; and 3, the numerous Confessions of Faith and catechisms of the Reformed Church.

An examination of all these sources would be necessary in order to furnish the evidence in full concerning the Reformed Doctrine; but this would make a series of articles or a book,

instead of one article of ordinary length. We will therefore waive, for the present at least, an examination of the first two sources, and confine our attention chiefly to the third, which, taken by itself, is the most important. The Catechisms and Confessions contain the most direct and positive expression of the Reformed faith. Though the language is here and there affected and modified by reference to the errors of Romanism on the one side, and of Rationalism, Anabaptism and Infidelity on the other, and must in all such cases, be interpreted in the light of the prevailing issues, yet it is thus affected and modified in a much less degree than the writings of theologians and divines, which are to a large extent of a controversial character. This is true especially of the doctrine of Baptism. On no doctrine is the language of the Catechisms and Confessions, taken together, more clear, consistent and unequivocal. And when particular forms of expression involve a reference to questions of the age, it happens that the language presents no difficulty, but is intelligible both to clergymen and laymen; for the many questions at issue then concerning the nature and efficacy of Baptism, are the very questions which are at issue now, and with which every intelligent Christian is conversant.

The principal and most important aspect of the question at issue now in the Reformed Church of America, including the Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational, Reformed Dutch and German Reformed Churches, is whether Holy Baptism is the Sacrament of Regeneration? Has Christ ordained this Sacrament for the remission of sins, and the communication of a new and spiritual life by the Holy Ghost? Is it the act of God, in which he translates the subject from the state of nature into the state of grace, from the kingdom of the Devil into the kingdom of Christ? Does a person, who is a child of the Devil through the fall of Adam and the inheritance of original sin, become, by Baptism, a member of the mystical body of Christ and thereby a child of God? These several questions are but different forms of presenting one general question, namely: Does Baptism take away the guilt and pollution of sin and communicate the new life of the Spirit in Christ Jesus?

We answer in the affirmative; and maintain that the doctrine we hold concerning the objective, saving efficacy of this Sacrament is the true Protestant and Reformed doctrine. Our opponents, comprising four-fifths, if not nine-tenths, of the ministry and laity belonging to the Reformed family of Churches, answer in the negative, and maintain that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is neither Reformed nor Protestant, but Romish.

This is one of the very questions that agitated the Reformed Church during the period of its organization; and in consequence the language of the Confessions in which the rationalistic errors of the sixteenth century are condemned and the positive truth taught, is as well adapted to the religious and theological mind of our day, as if these Confessions had been drawn up expressly for the purpose of lifting up a standard against the insidious unbelief of the nineteenth century.

CONFessions OF THE REFORMED CHURCH.

With the view accordingly of ascertaining what the Reformed doctrine on the subject of Baptism is, we proceed to examine the following Confessions and Catechisms: The Augsburg Confession; the Tetrapolitan Confession; the First Basel Confession; the Confession of Bohemia; the Second Basel or Former Helvetic Confession; Calvin's Catechism; the Gallican Confession; the Confession of Scotland; the Confession of England; the Belgic Confession; the Heidelberg Catechism; the Latter Helvetic Confession; the Confession of Sigismund; the Confession of Poland; the Westminister Confession, and the Larger Catechism.

The *Augsburg Confession*, drawn up by Melancthon, was, at the instance of the Emperor Charles the Fifth, presented to the Diet of Augsburg, by the most renowned Princes of Germany and other States of the Empire, in June 1530, and although claimed as the first symbol of the Lutheran Church, must be regarded as the first Confession of the Protestant Reformation, made before the Reformed and Lutheran tendencies had developed themselves into division and separation. It is a formal expression of the Reformed faith, as it stood at that time, no less than of the Lutheran faith, and ought therefore to be consulted

on the subject of Baptism, in order to get a complete view of the Reformed doctrine. The Augsburg Confession, because of this relation which it bears to the first period of Protestantism, is included by *Mess* in his *Sammlung symbolischer Bücher der Reformirten Kirche*, published in 1828.

The *Tetrapolitan Confession*, composed mainly by Bucer, was presented by the deputies from the four free cities, Strasburg, Constance, Memmingen and Lindau, to the Emperor at the same diet of Augsburg in 1530; these cities being unwilling to subscribe the Confession drawn up by Melancthon. It was designed to be both a positive statement of the Reformed faith and a vindication of themselves against the charge, that they had departed from the truth as taught by the Word of God. Like the Augsburg Confession, it was delivered in both the Latin and German language.

The *First Confession of Basel*, sometimes called the Confession of Mühlhausen, was, according to what we regard as the best authorities, composed in the German language about the year 1532. There are those who hold it to be coeval with the Augsburg Confession, the Tetrapolitan Confession and Zwingli's Exposition of Faith. The author is not certainly known. Some suppose it to have been the production of Oecolampadius, revised and improved by his successor Oswald Myconius. Subscribed by the ministers of Basel, it was first published in 1534. Then again in the year 1561, it was both recognised and received by the same ministers of Basel. It passed through many editions during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and acquired great reputation and great influence as a Reformed Confession.

Following the order of time we cite next the *Confession of Bohemia*, which dates back to 1535, when it was first published in the vernacular tongue, and submitted to the king, Ferdinand, as containing the faith of the barons and nobles of the kingdom. It received the approval, as appears from the preface, of Luther, Melancthon, and other divines of Wittemberg.

Bohemia had numerous confessions, which, though the same essentially, vary from each other in the order of topics and in

forms of expression. Of these, according to Niemeyer, two are especially worthy of regard. To both of these he has given a place in his *Collection of Reformed Confessions*. The one is a revision of the Confession of 1535, and published in 1573, in Latin and German.

Of this the *Harmony of Protestant Confessions*, first published in Latin at Geneva, in 1581; then in English at Cambridge, 1586; and recently edited by the Rev. Peter Hall, M. A., London, 1842, says: "The Confession of Bohemia, being the last-composed of four former, which were far more ancient, being recited in the same order of chapters and arguments, and somewhat more plainly expressed, and in the year 1573, published in divers places, was also approved by common testimony of the University of Wirtemberg; even as Masters Luther and Melanthon had approved the former, published in the year 1532, being altogether the same in doctrine with this, as Luther his Preface witnesseth. And we called it elsewhere the Confession of the Waldenses, following the common title assigned unto these churches."

The Second Confession of Basel, more commonly known as the *Former Helvetic Confession*, was written by Bullinger, Myconius and Grynaeus in 1536, under appointment of an ecclesiastical convention which had assembled for this purpose at Basel in the name of the different Protestant cantons of Switzerland. By the same authority it was afterwards ratified and published. It was submitted to the assembly of divines at Wirtemberg by Bucer and Capito. The year following, 1537, it was again submitted by Bucer, accompanied with an exposition, to the assembly of Smalcald, and approved by the whole assembly, as appears from Luther's letters to the Swiss.

The *Genevan Catechism* was first written in 1536, in French, by John Calvin for the use of the church of Geneva, but afterwards, at the instance of the ministers of Geneva, it was modified and enlarged, and published at Basel in Latin, in the year 1538.

The *Gallican Confession*, or the Confession of France, was first presented in French, in the year 1559, to Francis the

Second, King of France, at Amboise, in behalf of all the godly of that kingdom; again, in the year 1561, at Poissy, to Charles the Ninth; and at length also published in Latin by the pastors of the French churches, with a Preface addressed to all other evangelical pastors, in the year 1566.

The *Confession of Scotland* was first exhibited to, and allowed by, the three estates in Parliament, at Edinburgh, in the year 1560; again ratified at the same place, and by the same authority in 1567; and finally subscribed by his Majesty the King, and his household, at Holyrood House, January 28th, 1581. Written originally in the Scotch language, it was first published in 1568. It was subsequently translated into Latin, and published in 1612.

The principal *Anglican Confessions* are the Forty-two Articles of king Edward VI., drawn up and adopted by a Synod convened at London in the year 1552, and first published in London and Zurich in 1553; and the Thirty-nine Articles, the result of a revision of the Forty-two Articles, by the Synod of London, convened by authority of Queen Elizabeth, in the year 1562; the latter established by the solemn sanction of the State and the Church, being the recognized formula of faith which has prevailed in the Church of England, and in the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, down to the present day.

The *Confession of Belgium* was drawn up in 1561 or 1562, when Philip II. was about introducing the inquisition into the Netherlands for the suppression of the Reformed faith, with the view of averting the impending persecution. It was published in French, in the name of all the churches of Belgium, in the year 1556. In the year 1579 it was translated into the Belgian tongue, and in the public Synod of Belgium was repeated and confirmed.

The *Heidelberg or Palatinate Catechism*, written in German by Zacharias Ursinus and Casper Olevianus, under authority and by direction of Frederick III, Elector of the Palatinate, was laid before a Synod composed of representatives of the churches of his dominions, and unanimously adopted, January 1563. It was published in the same year both in German and Latin.

The *Latter Helvetic Confession* was written in Latin by Henry Bullinger, in 1562. At the instance of Frederick the Third, Elector of the Palatinate, it was translated into the German language, and published in 1566, in order to vindicate the faith of the Reformed Churches against the aspersions of the Lutherans. It was approved and subscribed not only by the ministers of Zurich, and their confederates of Berne, Schaffhausen, Sangallia, Rhetia, Mühlhausen and Bienne; but also by the churches of Geneva, of Savoy, of Poland, and likewise of Hungary and of Scotland. In the course of time it came to be known and regarded as the proper Swiss Confession.

John Sigismund, Elector of Brandenburg, 1608–1619, provoked by the bitter hostility of the Lutherans to the Reformed to examine the doctrines of the Reformed Church, was constrained to embrace the Reformed faith, and passed over from the Lutheran to the Reformed communion formally, by celebrating the Lord's Supper according to the Reformed cultus, in 1613. This transition led to the preparation of a *Confession of Faith*, which was published in May, 1614.

The *Confession of Poland* is the Confession submitted by the Reformed theologians to the *Colloquium* at Thorn, in 1645, held at the instance and by the authority of Wladislaus, IV. King of Poland, 1632–1648, for the purpose of abating the fierce dissensions which prevailed among the Roman Catholics, Reformed and Lutherans in his kingdom, and bore the title: "Declaratio doctrinæ ecclesiæ Reformatorum catholice." It soon acquired authority as a Confession of the Reformed Church, though of secondary importance.

The *Confession of Faith*, and the *Larger and Shorter Catechisms*, of the Presbyterian Church are the work of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, which, in the reign of Charles I., was convened by act of the Long Parliament, for the purpose of "settling the Government and Liturgy of the Church of England, and for vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the said Church from false aspersions and interpretations." The Assembly met in the chapel of Henry VII., July 1st, 1643, and continued its sessions nearly five years, until Feb. 22d, 1648.

Though the immediate and specific design of the Westminster Assembly was not accomplished, as the political reaction and the restoration brought back with it the polity and cultus of the Episcopal Church, yet the work it performed has proven itself to be of vast significance. Whilst the Westminster Confession and Catechisms failed to become the faith of the Church of England, they were cordially adopted by the Reformed Church of Scotland, and have been held as the authoritative formularies of Christian doctrine in Scotland, Ireland and America, by all branches of the Presbyterian Church, for more than two centuries. And the Directory which the Assembly prepared has regulated and moulded Presbyterian worship, the worship of all the English Calvinistic Churches, and even supplanted, in great measure, the Palatinate Liturgy in the Reformed Dutch and German Reformed Churches of America.

Of these fifteen Confessions of the Reformed Church, of which we have now given a brief historical notice, there are six which possess primary and general authority, being by universal acknowledgment the true exponents of the Reformed faith as it stood in the sixteenth century. These are the Former and Latter *Helvetic Confessions*, the *Gallican*, *Scotish* and *Belgic Confessions*, and the *Heidelberg Catechism*. With these symbolical books the *Confession of Faith* of the Westminster Assembly and the *Larger Catechism* take rank as authoritative exponents of the faith of the Puritan branch of the Reformed Church as it prevailed in the century following. The other Confessions hold a secondary and subordinate position; not because they fail to be in full harmony with those acknowledged authorities, but because, owing to their form, design and local relations, their influence was more limited and less powerful. But we will examine them also, in order to show that the Reformed doctrine of Baptism was one and the same in all countries where the Reformed Church obtained a foothold.

As the Decrees of the National Synod of the Reformed Belgic Churches, assembled at Dort in 1618 and 1619, are limited to the celebrated Five Points of Calvinism,—divine predestination, redemption by the death of Christ, natural depravity, conver-

sion, and final perseverance,—they do not come under review in the examination of the question we have in hand.

REFORMED DOCTRINE OF A SACRAMENT.

The doctrine of Holy Baptism is rooted in the more general doctrine concerning a Sacrament. The nature of a Sacrament is the general nature of Baptism. Therefore, before we proceed to quote and examine the teachings of the Confessions on the particular question before us, we will first inquire into the Reformed idea of a Sacrament. The general being the basis of the particular, a correct apprehension of the one will qualify us to institute an intelligent inquiry into the other.

According to the idea universally prevalent among the Reformed Churches in all countries during the sixteenth century, a Sacrament is the visible *sign* of a present invisible grace. The visible sign is the natural element; in the Eucharist, bread and wine; in Baptism, water. The invisible grace is the spiritual gift of God. In Baptism, the gift is the presence and effective operation of the blood and Spirit of Christ; in the Eucharist, it is the nourishment of the believer unto everlasting life by the communication of the body and blood, or the glorified human nature, of Christ. The Sacrament is not an empty sign, not the natural element by itself. Nor is it the abstract grace of God; grace apart from the natural element. But a Sacrament is the institution of Christ in which the two things, the natural element and the spiritual gift, are one. They are not identical. The natural element is not transmuted into the spiritual gift; so that the natural element is only such in appearance, and not in reality. But the natural element remains what it was before it was made an essential part of the sacrament; water continues to be real natural water; bread and wine continue to be real, natural bread and wine. But the spiritual gift is joined to the natural element by the power of the Holy Ghost; and this union of the visible natural and the invisible spiritual in the institution, constitutes the Sacrament. In the absence of either, the Sacrament does not exist. Were the invisible grace not present in the administration, the natural

element, for want of the thing signified, would not be a sign. Were the natural element annihilated by transmutation into the invisible grace, this present grace, for want of the external sign, would not be the thing signified. Either form of error destroys the Reformed idea of a Sacrament.

In virtue of the union of the natural and spiritual in the Sacrament, the natural element certifies the presence of the spiritual gift for the purpose of salvation. It is thus a *seal* no less than a sign. The sign makes certain to faith the real presence of what is signified. It cannot certify the presence of what it does not signify. In Baptism, the water does not signify the penitence and faith of the subject, and therefore does not certify the genuineness of his personal experience. But it signifies the efficacious operation of the blood and Spirit of Christ. This grace being as truly present as the water, the administration of the Sacrament by the application of water in the name of the holy Trinity, certifies the invisible or spiritual work to be as real as the external transaction. In the holy Eucharist the bread and the cup do not signify the moral and spiritual fitness of the communicant, and therefore they do not certify his conversion and sanctification. But these signs certify the presence of the divine-human Christ as the true spiritual food of the believer. Christ Himself being thus as truly present as the bread and the cup, the communication of these elements by the minister certifies the communion of Christ with the believer to be as real as the outward eating and drinking.

The Sacrament being the visible sign of present invisible grace, it assures the believer of the reality of the divine act. The idea of sign involves the idea of seal. Were the Sacrament not a seal, it would not be a sign. As the sign is objective, so is the seal. Both pertain, not to men, not to personal experience, but to the Person and work of Christ as connected by the power of the Holy Ghost with the natural element. Thus the Reformed idea of sign completes itself in the idea of seal.

We have now presented, in our own language, the Reformed

idea of a Sacrament, as drawn from the Reformed confessions. Let us in the next place examine the authorities themselves.

The Latter Helvetic Confession says: "Sacraments are mystical symbols, or holy rites, or sacred actions, ordained of God Himself, consisting of His Word, of outward signs, and of things signified; whereby He keepeth in continual memory, and oftentimes recalleth to mind, in His Church, His great benefits bestowed upon man; and whereby He sealeth up His promises and outwardly representeth, and, as it were, offereth unto our sight those things which inwardly He performeth unto us, and therewithal strengtheneth and increaseth our faith through the working of God's Spirit in our hearts."

"The principal thing, which in all the Sacraments is offered of the Lord, and chiefly regarded of the godly of all ages, which some have called the substance and matter of the Sacraments, is Christ our Saviour; that only sacrifice, Heb. x. 12, and that Lamb of God slain from the beginning of the world, Rev. xiii. 8."

"And as in the Old Church the Sacraments consisted of the Word, the sign, and the thing signified, so even at this day they are composed, as it were, of the same parts. For the Word of God maketh them Sacraments, which before were none; for they are consecrated by the Word and declared to be sanctified by Him who first ordained them. To sanctify or consecrate a thing, is to dedicate it unto God, and unto holy uses; that is, to take it from the common and ordinary use, and to appoint it to some holy use. For the signs that be in Sacraments are drawn from common use, things external and visible. As in Baptism; the outward sign is the element of water, and that visible washing which is done by the Minister. But the thing signified is regeneration, and the cleansing from sins. Likewise, in the Lord's Supper; the outward sign is bread and wine, taken from things commonly used for meat and drink. But the thing signified is the body of Christ which was given; and His blood which was shed for us, and the communion of the body and blood of the Lord. Wherefore the water, bread and wine, considered in their own nature, and out of this holy use

and institution of the Lord, are only that which they are called, and which we find them to be. But let the Word of God be added to them, together with invocation upon his Holy Name, and the renewing of their first institution and sanctification, then these signs are consecrated and declared to be sanctified by Christ. For Christ's first institution and consecration of the Sacraments standeth yet in force in the Church of God, in such sort, that they which celebrate the Sacraments no otherwise than the Son Himself from the beginning hath appointed, have still even to this day, the use and benefit of that first and most excellent consecration. And for this cause, in the administration of the Sacraments, the very words of Christ are repeated. And forasmuch as we learn out of the Word of God, that these signs were appointed unto another end and use than commonly they are used unto, therefore we teach that they now, in their holy use, do take upon them the names of things signified, and are not still called bare water, bread, or wine; but that the water is called *regeneration* and *bath of the new birth*; and the bread and wine *the body and blood of the Lord*, or the pledges and Sacraments of His body and blood. Tit. iii. 5. 1 Cor. x. 16. Not that the signs are turned into the things signified, or cease to be that which in their own nature they are, for then they could not be Sacraments, which would consist only of the thing signified and have no signs; but therefore do the signs bear the names of the things, because they be mystical tokens of holy things, and because the signs and the things signified are sacramentally joined together; joined together, I say, or united by a mystical signification, and by the purpose and will of Him who first instituted them. For the water, bread, and wine, are not common, but holy signs. And He that instituted water in Baptism did not institute it with that mind and purpose, that the faithful should only be dipped in the water of Baptism; and He who commanded the bread to be eaten and the wine to be drunk in the Supper, did not mean that the faithful should only receive bread and wine, without any further mystery, as they eat bread at home in their houses; but that they should spiritually be partakers of the things sig-

nified, and by faith be truly purged from their sins, and be partakers of Christ.”*

We deem it scarcely necessary to follow this statement with any extended quotations from other Reformed Confessions, as it teaches the doctrine in question clearly and forcibly, both in a positive and in a negative form. It teaches what a Sacrament is in direct terms, and denies the errors with which the

* As the Swiss Confessions may not be accessible to many of our readers, and as this passage is perspicuous, comprehensive and very important in its relation to the doctrine of the Sacraments as taught in later Confessions and received in all the Reformed Churches, we subjoin the original text:

“Sicut autem quondam Sacraamenta constabant verbo, signo et re significata, ita nunc quoque iisdem veluti partibus absolvuntur. Nam verbo Dei fiunt, quae antea non fuerunt, Sacraamenta. Consecrantur enim verbo, et sanctificata esse ostenduntur ab eo qui instituit. Et sanctificare vel consecrare, est rem aliquam Deo sacrificare usibus dedicare, hoc est, a communi vel profano usu segregare et sacro usui destinare. Sunt enim in Sacraementis signa potita ex usu vulgari, res externae et visibles. In baptismo enim, signum est elementum aquae, ablutione illa visibilis, qua fit per ministrum. Res autem significata, est regeneratio vel ablutione peccatis. In cena vero Domini, signum est panis et vinum, sumptum ex communi usu cibi et potus. Res autem significata, est ipsum traditum Domini corpus, et sanguis ejus effusus pro nobis, vel communio corporis et sanguinis Domini. Proliude aqua, panis et vinum sua natura, et extra institutionem divinam, se usum sanctum, duntaxat id sunt, quod esse dicuntur, et experimur. Ceterum, si accedat Domini verbum, cum invocatione divini nominis, et renovatione prima institutionis et sanctificationis, signa ista consecrantur, et sanctificata a Christo esse ostenduntur. Manet enim semper efficax in ecclesia Dei prima Christi institutio et consecratio sacramentorum, adeo ut qui non aliter celebrent Sacraamenta, quam ipse Dominus ab initio instituit, fruantur etiam nunc prima illa consecratione omnium præstantissima. Et idio recitantur in celebratione sacramentorum ipsa verba Christi. Et quoniam verbo Dei discimus, quod signa haec in aliis finem sint instituta a Domino, quam usurpentur vulgo, ideo docemus signa nunc in usu sacro, usurpare rerum signatarum vocabula, nec appellari amplius aquam tantum, panem et vinum, sed etiam regenerationem vel lavorum renovationis, item corpus et sanguinem Domini, vel symbola aut Sacraamenta corporis et sanguinis Domini. Non quod symbola mutentur in res significatas, et desinant esse id quod sunt sua natura. Alioqui enim Sacraamenta non essent, quae re significata duntaxat constarent, signa non essent; sed ideo usurpant signa rerum nomina, quod rerum sacraorum sunt symbola mystica, et signa et res significata, inter se sacramentaliter conjungantur, conjungantur inquam, vel uniantur per significationem mysticam, et voluntatem vel consilium ejus, qui Sacraamenta instituit. Non enim aqua, panis et vinum, sunt signa vulgaria, sed sacra. Et qui instituit aquam baptismi, non ea voluntate consilioque instituit, ut fideles aqua duntaxat baptismi perfundantur: et qui jussit in Cœna, panem edere, et vinum bibere, non hoc voluit, ut fideles panem et vinum tantum percipiant, sine mysterio, sicut domi sum panem manducant, sed ut rebus quoque significatis, spiritualiter communiceant, et vere per fidem abluantur a peccatis, et Christo participent.”

truth may be confounded. Yet we will add a few brief extracts from some others in order to show the unanimity with which this idea of a Sacrament was affirmed.

We intend to quote the *twentieth article* of the Former Helvetic Confession, which speaks of the *Force and Efficacy of the Sacraments*, in connection with Baptism, and shall therefore not anticipate it here. But we will give a few passages from the *Declaration* of the same Confession. "A Sacrament is not only a sign, but it is made up of two things, to wit: of a visible or earthly sign, and of the thing signified, which is heavenly; the which two although they make but one Sacrament, yet it is one thing which is received with the body, another thing which the faithful mind, being taught by the Spirit of God, doth receive. For the signs and the things signified by the signs, do cleave together only by a certain mystical union, or, as others speak, by a Sacramental union; neither be they so made one, that one is made in its nature the other, or that one is contained in the other."

"And seeing that the Sacraments are the institutions and work of the Lord Himself, the faithful do receive them, not as certain superfluous inventions of men, as if at the hand of men, but as his heavenly gifts, and that at the very hand of the Lord. For touching the Word of the Gospel which he preached, the Apostle writeth thus: 'When ye received of us the Word, whereby ye learned God, ye did not receive it as the word of men, but, as it was indeed, as the Word of God, who also worketh in you that believe.' 1 Thess. ii. 13. The like reason is there of the Sacraments. Therefore just as we do, and always did, receive these sentences of Scripture touching the Ministry of the Word, namely: The Minister doth convert, remit sins, open the eyes and hearts of men, give faith and the Spirit: so, being well understood, we do acknowledge also these sentences touching the Sacraments, namely: The Minister, through Baptism, doth regenerate, and wash away sins; he doth distribute and present the body and blood of the Lord. Acts xxii. 16. Matt. xxvi. 26. And it is manifest that the ancient Fathers did use such kind of speeches, because that by

this means they would propound and commend more royally the gifts of God."*

The Bohemian Confession says: "The Sacraments may be called the holy covenants of God with His Church, and of the Church with God; the ministration of faith and love, by which the conjunction and union of God, and of Christ our Lord, with believing people, and theirs again with Christ, and that among themselves, is made and perfected, in one spiritual body of the Church; by which also, even as by the Word, Christ and His Spirit do cause in the faithful, that is, in those that use them worthily, a precious participation of His excellent merit; neither doth He suffer them to be only bare and naked ministrations and ceremonies; but those things which they signify and witness outwardly, them doth He work inwardly to salvation, profitably and effectually; that is, He cleanseth, nourisheth, satisfieth, looseth, remitteth and confirmeth."†

The following is from the twenty-first article of the Confession of Scotland: "The Sacraments not only do make a visible difference betwixt His people and those that are without His covenant, but also do exercise the faith of His children, and, by participation of the same Sacraments, do seal in their hearts the assurance of His promise, and of that most blessed conjunction, union and society, which the elect have with their head, Christ Jesus. And thus we utterly condemn the vanity of those that affirm Sacraments to be nothing else but naked and bare signs. No; we assuredly believe that by Baptism we are ingrafted into Christ Jesus, to be made partakers of His righteousness, by which our sins are covered, and remitted; and also that in the Supper, rightly used, Christ Jesus is so joined with us, that he becometh the very nourishment and food of our souls."‡

* Declaration of the Former Helvetic Confession, under the head of *Holy Symbols*. Quoted from The Harmony of Protestant Confessions, 1581. Edited by the Rev. Peter Hall, M.A. London, 1842.

† Confession of Bohemia, chap. 11. Hall's Harm. of Prot. Conf.

‡ "Atque Sacra menta illa tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti nunc a Deo instituta, non tantum visibiliter inter populum ejus et eos qui extra foedus sunt distin-

The Belgian Confession uses language of the same import. "The Sacraments are visible signs and tokens of internal and invisible things; by the which, as by certain means, God Himself worketh within us, through the power of the Holy Ghost. Therefore they are not vain or idle signs, neither yet ordained of God to deceive or frustrate us of our hope. For the truth of our Sacraments is Jesus Christ, without whom they are of no value."*

These citations fully sustain the general view we have presented of a Sacrament as held by the Reformed Church of the sixteenth century, and aid us in apprehending the true meaning of the sixty-sixth question of the Heidelberg Catechism. "The Sacraments are visible, holy signs and seals, appointed of God for this end, that by the use thereof He may the more fully declare and seal to us the promise of the Gospel, namely, that He grants us out of free grace the forgiveness of sins and everlasting life, for the sake of the one sacrifice of Christ accomplished on the cross."†

guere, sed etiam fidem suorum filiorum exercere, et participationem eorumdem sacramentorum in illorum cordibus, certitudinem promissionis ejus, et felicissime illius conjunctionis, unionis et societatis, quam electi cum capite suo Iesu Christo habent, obsignare. Itaque vanitatem eorum, qui affirmant, Sacraenta nil aliud quam meret nuda signa esse, omnino damnamus. Quin potius, certo credimus, per baptismum, nos in Christo Iesu inseri; justitiaeque ejus per quam omnia nostra peccata teguntur et remittuntur, participes fieri: atque etiam quod in Cœna Domini rite usurpata, Christus ita nobis conjungitur, quod sit ipissimum animarum nostrarum nutrimentum et pabulum." Conf. Scot. Fidel, 21.

* Conf. Belgica. Art. xxxiii. De Sacramentis. "Sunt enim Sacraenta signa, ac symbola visibilis rerum internarum et invisibilium, per quae, eis per media, Deus ipse virtute Spiritus Sancti in nobis operatur. Itaque signa illa minime vana sunt, aut vana; nec ad nos decipiendos aut frustrandos instituta. Ipsorum enim veritas ipse Jesus Christus, sine quo nullius prouersus essent momenti."

† Ursinus being the principal author of the Heidelberg Catechism, we quote some passages from his Theses on the Sacraments, given in his exposition of the text, in order to show the sense which he attached to his own language:

"There are two things to be considered in all Sacraments; the signs which are visible, earthly and corporeal; these are the rites and ceremonies, the things which are visible and corporeal, which God exhibits to us by the Minister, and which we receive corporeally; that is, by the members and senses of the body. Then we have the things signified, which are invisible, heavenly and spiritual, which include Christ Himself and all His benefits, and are communicated unto us of God by faith spiritually; that is, by the virtue and power of the Holy Spirit.

A Sacrament is not the external visible sign. This by itself is only natural water, or natural bread and wine. But the external sign, the natural element, is an integral part of a Sacrament. Without it there cannot be a Sacrament. On this point there is not a dissenting voice. All the Confessions condemn the notion that a Sacrament is a naked, empty, visible sign.

A Sacrament is not invisible grace, not Christ, not the blood and Spirit of Christ. In this consists the truth and virtue of a Sacrament; but a Sacrament in itself, by its very conception, as it obtained not only in the sixteenth century but in every age of the Church, is not equivalent to the idea of Christ, forgiveness of sins, or sanctification. Grace may confront us as a fact, or a doctrine, or a life, but in itself, disconnected from a natural element as its symbol, it belongs essentially to a category different from that of a Sacrament.

A Sacrament is that in which these two things are so really conjoined by the *Word of God*, that they are one. The Word of God makes the natural element the holy sign of a present, invisible, divine grace. In the first instance, Christ instituted the Sacraments by His Word. He took the natural bread, brake it, and said: Take, eat, this is my body. After the same manner, also, He took the cup, saying: This cup is the New Testament in my blood. By this, His Word and deed, the Holy Eucharist came into existence. So He commanded

"The change of the signs is not physical or natural, but merely relative; it has no respect to their nature or substance, which remains the same, but only to their use.

"The union between the signs and the things signified, is in like manner not natural or local, but relative, by the appointment of God, by which things invisible and spiritual are represented by those that are visible and corporeal, as by visible words, and are exhibited and received in connection with the signs in their lawful use.

"The names and properties of the things signified are attributed to the signs; and, on the other hand, the names of the signs are attributed to the things signified, on account of their analogy, or on account of the signification of the things through the signs, and on account of the joint exhibition and reception of the things with the signs in their lawful use.

"The things signified are always received in connection with the signs in the lawful use of the Sacraments. The signs are, therefore, not by any means empty or insignificant, notwithstanding the things are received in one way, and the signs in another." Williard's Ursinus, pp. 354, 355.

His Apostles to baptize in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. By the same Word of God the force of the original institution is perpetuated. "Christ's first institution and consecration standeth yet in force in the Church of God." The Minister, clothed with Christ's authority, represents Him, and officiates in His name. Christ speaks effectively in the divine Word which the lips of His minister utter. Thus whenever His minister takes the natural element and consecrates it by the *Word of God*, it ceases, in virtue of the power of Christ in His Word, to be a bare, naked, natural element, and becomes a holy sign, exhibiting the very presence of supernatural, saving grace. Not that the natural element ceases to be natural, but with the natural there is conjoined mystically the supernatural. For "they which celebrate the Sacraments no otherwise than the Lord Himself from the beginning hath appointed, have still, even to this day, the use and benefit of that most excellent consecration." It is this mystical conjunction, by the Word of God, of invisible grace with the visible sign, that constitutes a Sacrament according to all the Confessions of the Reformed Church. So real is this union, that these signs, "in this their holy use, take upon them the names of the things signified, and are not still called bare water, bread, or wine; but the water is called *regeneration* and the *bath of new birth*, and the bread and wine are called *the body and blood of the Lord*."^{*}

The *efficacy* of a Sacrament does not attach to the natural element as natural; not to water as bare water; not to bread and wine as bare bread and wine. The Confessions are unanimous in repudiating this absurd notion. "The outward signs are not the self-same thing, substantially and naturally, which they do signify; neither do they give it of themselves, and by their own power, no more than the Minister doth; but the Lord useth the Minister, and the signs and the Word, to this end, that, of His mere grace, He may represent, declare, visibly

* Conf. Helv. Posterior.

show, and set before our eyes, His heavenly gifts; and all this according to His promise."*

Nor is saving efficacy predicated of abstract divine grace. Non-sacramental grace, or the notion that the Holy Ghost by an immediate operation regenerates and saves men, is not recognized by the Confessions. While the Spirit by the preaching of the Gospel enlightens and awakens sinners before Baptism, this work of the Spirit does not supersede the necessity of the Sacraments, but only prepares the subject for the right observance of them. According to the Reformed idea of the established economy of salvation, there are in the Sacraments no bare, naked signs. "We utterly condemn the vanity of those, that affirm Sacraments to be nothing else but naked and bare signs."† On the other hand, the new life in Christ is not accessible to any who refuse to observe the Sacraments. "We condemn them also, who, because of the invisible things, do despise the visible, and think the signs superfluous, because they do already enjoy the things themselves."‡ The efficacy of the Sacraments, accordingly, does not attach to divine grace as such; not to grace conferred before Baptism, as if in virtue of the grace thus previously bestowed the Sacraments were made efficacious; nor to grace at hand and conferred independently of the Sacraments, as if saving grace were bestowed by an act of God which is direct and immediate, an act not mediated and conditioned by the ordinances of His own appointment.

But saving efficacy is predicated of a *Sacrament* proper; not of the natural element itself, nor of supernatural grace as such, neither one of which is a Sacrament; but of supernatural grace mystically conjoined with the natural element in the divine institution. In other words, the virtue of a Sacrament is not in the sign, nor in the thing signified, separately taken;

* Declaration of the Former Helvetic Confession.

† Conf. Scot. 21. De Sac. "Itaque vanitatem eorum, qui affirmant, Sacraenta nil aliud quam mera et nuda signs esse, omnino damnamus."

‡ Conf. Helv. Posterior. 19. De Sac. "Neque eos probamus, qui propter invisibilis, aspernantur in sacramentis visibilis, adeoque signs sibi credunt fore supervaria, quod rebus se jam frui arbitrantur." Niemeyer's Ref'd. Conf., p. 516.

but in the mystical union of the sign and the thing signified ; for it is the mystical *union* of the natural and the supernatural, effected by the power of the Holy Ghost, in which, according to all the Reformed Confessions, the Sacraments consist.

REFORMED DOCTRINE OF HOLY BAPTISM.

This general idea of a Sacrament underlies the Reformed doctrine of Holy Baptism.

From the Confessions and Catechisms enumerated, we proceed now to quote at length their deliverances on the question, reserving comment and argument until we have given a complete exhibit of what they teach.

From the Confession of Augsburg, A. D. 1530.

Art. 9. "Concerning Baptism they teach, that it is necessary to salvation, as a ceremony ordained of Christ. Also, that by Baptism the grace of God is offered : and that young infants are to be baptized : and that they, being by Baptism commended unto God, are received into God's favor, and are made the sons of God; as Christ witnesseth, speaking of little children in the Church. 'It is not the will of your Heavenly Father, that any of these little ones should perish.' Matt. xviii, 14. They condemn the Anabaptists, which allow not the Baptism of infants, and hold that infants are saved, though they die without Baptism, and be not within the Church of God."

This in another edition is set down thus :

"Touching Baptism they teach, that it is necessary to salvation, and that by Baptism the grace of God is offered ; that children are to be baptized ; and that such as by Baptism be presented to God, are received into His favor. They condemn the Anabaptists, that allow not of children's Baptism, and hold that children are saved without Baptism."

We have quoted this Article as translated in Hall's Harmony of Protestant Confessions ; where the following note is appended : "Understand this by those things, which afterward were declared in the Agreement made at Wirtemburg in the year 1536, the 29th day of May ; where these words be read : 'Master Luther and his fellows do agree upon this, that, by

the power of Christ, even those which are not baptized may be saved. But it is necessary that these should not condemn Baptism. And hence it is that they will have infants to be baptized of necessity."

From the Tetrapolitan Confession, 1530.

Chap. 17. "As touching Baptism, we confess, that which the Scripture doth in divers places teach thereof: that we by it are buried into the death of Christ, Rom. 6: 3, 4; are made one body, 1 Cor. 12: 18; and do put on Christ, Gal. 3: 27; that it is the font of regeneration, Tit. 3: 5; that it washeth away sins, and saveth us. But all these things we so understand, as St. Peter hath interpreted them, where he saith: To the figure whereof, Baptism, that now is, answering, doth also save us; not by putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the profession of a good conscience toward God, 1 Pet. 3: 21. For without faith it is impossible to please God, Heb. 11: 6. And we are saved by grace, and not by our works, Eph. 2: 8, 9. And seeing that Baptism is a Sacrament of that covenant, which God hath made with those that are his, promising that He will be their God, and the God of their seed, and that He will be a revenger of their wrongs, and will take them for His people; to conclude, seeing it is a token of the renewing of the spirit, which is wrought by Christ; therefore they do teach that it is to be given to infants also, as well as that in times past under Moses they were circumcised. For we are indeed the children of Abraham; and therefore that promise: I will be thy God and the God of thy seed, Gal. 3: 7, pertains no less unto us, than it did to that ancient people."

From the First Confession of Basel, 1534.

"And just as in Baptism, wherein is offered to us by the Minister of the Church, the washing away of sins, which certainly the Father, Son and Holy Ghost only can accomplish, there remaineth true water; so also in the Lord's Supper, wherein is figured and offered to us by the Minister of the Church, with the bread and cup of the Lord, and with the words

of the Supper, the true body and the true blood of Christ, there remaineth bread and wine."*

From the Confession of Bohemia, 1535.

We quote from the *Harmony of Confessions* of 1581. "Touching holy Baptism it is taught, that men must believe and profess, that this is a Sacrament, or wholesome ministry of the New Testament, instituted of Christ the Lord, concerning which the faithful ministers have in charge, that by the administration hereof they benefit the holy Church. This Sacrament consisteth of an outward washing that is done with water, with calling on the name of the holy Trinity; that of the element and the word there may arise, and be jointly made withal, a Sacrament. And that washing is used both to signify, and to witness, a spiritual washing and inward cleansing of the Holy Ghost from the disease of hereditary sin, and from other sins, the guilt of which is here forgiven and taken away; and to the attaining of a new manner of birth, that is, of regeneration, or a washing with water in the word of life. Acts 2: 38; 22: 16. For we believe that whatsoever by Baptism, as by a Sacrament added to the word of the Gospel, is in the outward ceremony signified and witnessed, all that doth the Lord God work and perform inwardly; that is, that He washeth away sin, Tit. 3: 5; begetteth a man again, and bestoweth salvation upon him, John 3: 5; and, through the washing of water, cleanseth by the word the Society of His Church, Eph. 5: 26, clotheth and appareleth it with His Son, Gal. 3: 27; burieth and taketh away sin, Rom. 6: 4; and giveth testimony to, and sealeth the peace of a good conscience, 1 Pet. 3: 21. For Baptism is not a washing away of the outward filth of the flesh, but the stipulation or promise that a good conscience maketh unto God. For the bestowing of these excellent fruits was

* "Und glych wie in dem Tauff, darinn uns die abwesung von den Sünden, die doch allein der Vatter, Son und heilig Geist, ussrichten müssend, durch den Diener der Kylchen, angebotten, blybt war wasser. Also auch, in des Herren Nachtmal, in uns, mit des Herren brot und tranck, sampt den worten des Nachtmals, der war lyb und das war blut Christi, durch den Diener der Kylchen fürbildet, und angebotten würdet, blybt brot und win." Basil. prior Conf. Fidei.

Holy Baptism given and granted to the Church ; which the faithful shepherds of souls ought to administer, and which the faithful people of Christ, touching the receiving thereof, ought to use lawfully, but once only ; yet, in deed and truth, throughout their whole life."

From the Former Helvetic Confession, 1536.

Art. 20. "The signs, which in the Church of God are called Sacraments, are two : Baptism and the Lord's Supper. These, being tokens of secret things, do not consist of bare signs, but of signs and things also. For in Baptism water is the sign, and the thing itself is regeneration, and adoption among the people of God. . . . Whereupon we affirm that Sacraments are not only tokens of human fellowship, but also pledges of the grace of God, by which the Ministers do work together with the Lord, to that end which He doth promise, offer and bring to pass ; yet so, as we said before of the ministry of the Word, that all the saving power is to be ascribed to the Lord alone."*

Art. 21. "Baptism, according to the institution of the Lord, is the font of regeneration, the which the Lord doth give to His chosen in a visible sign, by the ministry of the Church, in such sort as we have declared before.† In which holy font we do therefore dip our infants, because that it is not lawful for us to reject them from the company of the people of God, which are born of us, who are the people of God, and all but pointed out by the voice of God ; especially seeing we ought godly to presume of their election."

The Declaration of the same Confession presented by Bucer to the Assembly at Smalcald in 1537, says : "Baptism is a

*The text is a translation from the Latin. We add the German: 20. "Deren selchen, die man sacrament nempt, sind zwey, namlich der touff, und dz nachtmal des heren. Dic sacrament sind beduetliche heilige zeichen, und hoher heimlichen dingen, die aber nit blosse und lere zeichen sind, sunder sy bestond in zeichen und welslichen dingen. Dann im touff ist das wasser das zeichen, das weselich aber und geistlich ist die widergeburth und die usfnemung in das volk gottes."

†21. "Der touff ist nur der insatzung des heren, ein widergeberliche abwesung, wölche der her sinen usserwölfen mit einem sichtbaren zeichen, durch den dienst der kichen wie obengeredt und erlütret ist, anbültet und darstelt."

Sacrament wherein the Lord by a visible sign doth testify His grace unto us ; whereby He doth regenerate us, and cleanse us from our sins, and also receive us to be His people, that we may live to Christ, die to the old Adam, and be partakers of the good things of Christ. For we are all born sinners ; whereupon we have need of regeneration, and the purging of our sins, which cometh to pass by the free mercy of God ; whereby also we are received into the covenant, that, being buried into His death, we may rise again in newness of life."

From the Genevan Catechism by Calvin, 1538.

"What is the significance of Baptism ?

It has two parts ; on the one hand, the forgiveness of sins is figured, and on the other spiritual regeneration.

What resemblance does water bear to these things, that it may represent them ?

The forgiveness of sin is a kind of bath, in which our souls are cleansed of their stains, for only by water is the filth of the body washed away.

What as to regeneration ?

Since its beginning is the mortification of our nature but the end that we be new creatures, the figure of death is set before us in this, that water is poured upon the head ; but the figure of a new life in this, that we do not remain sunk under the water, but for a moment at least we go as it were into the grave that we may immediately rise again.

Do you think that the water is the bath of the soul ?

By no means. For it is wrong to snatch this honor from the blood of Christ, which was poured forth to this end that, having cleansed us from all our sins, He might present us pure and without spot before God. 1 Pet. 1: 19 ; John 1: 7. And we possess the fruit of this cleansing, when the Holy Spirit sprinkles our consciences with that sacred blood. But the seal we have in the Sacrament.

Do you then ascribe nothing more to the water than this only, that it is a figure of washing ?

I regard it as a figure with which the truth is at the same time conjoined. For God in promising to us His gifts does not

deceive us. Hence it is certain that both the pardon of sins and the new life are offered to us, and received by us, in Baptism.*

Is this grace bestowed on all indiscriminately ?

As many by their wickedness shut up the way to it, they make it of no effect for themselves. Therefore the fruit comes to none but to believers only. Yet for this reason, nothing is abated of the nature of Baptism.

But whence is regeneration ?

From the death of Christ, and also from His resurrection. For by the power of His death, our old man is crucified, and the corruption of our nature is in a manner buried, that it may no longer live in us. But that we are changed into a new life unto obedience of the righteousness of God, this is the benefit of the resurrection.

How are these benefits conferred upon us through Baptism ?

Because, we put on Christ and are given His Spirit, unless, by rejecting the promises here offered to us, we render them unfruitful."

From the Gallican Confession, 1559.

Art. 35. "We acknowledge that there are two only Sacra-
ments common to the whole Church. Whereof the first is Bap-
tism : the which is given to us to testify our adoption ; because
that therein we are ingrafted into Christ's body, that, being
washed in His blood, we may also be renewed to holiness of
life by His Spirit. This also we say ; that although we are
baptized but once, yet the fruit of baptism doth pertain to the
whole course of our life : that this promise, to wit, that Christ
will be always unto us sanctification, and justification may be seal-
ed up in us with a pure and firm seal. Furthermore, although Bap-
tism is a Sacrament of faith and repentance, yet, seeing that, to-
gether with their parents, God doth account their posterity also
to be of the Church, we affirm, that infants, being born of holy
parents, are by the authority of Christ to be baptized."†

* " Proinde et peccatorum veniam et vitae novitatem offerri nobis in Baptismo, et
recipi a nobis certum est." Cat. Gen. 5, De Sac.

† Art. xxxv. Agnoscimus duo tantum Sacra-
menta toti Ecclesiae communia, quo-

Art. 38. "We say therefore, that the element of water, be it never so frail, doth notwithstanding truly witness or confirm unto us the inward washing of our souls in the blood of Jesus Christ, by the virtue and efficacy of the Holy Ghost."*

From the Confession of Scotland, 1560.

Art. 21. "We totally condemn those who affirm that the Sacraments are nothing more than mere naked signs. But on the contrary, we believe certainly, that, through Baptism, we are ingrafted into Jesus Christ,† and are made partakers of His righteousness through which all our sins are covered and remitted."

From the Anglican Confessions.

The XLII Articles of Edward VI, 1552. "Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and a mark of difference whereby Christians are distinguished from those who are not Christians, but it is also a sign of regeneration, whereby those who receive Baptism rightly, are, as by an instrument, grafted into the Church; the promises of the remission of sins and our adoption to be sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly sealed; faith is confirmed, and grace is increased by virtue of prayer unto God."

Of the Thirty-nine Articles, 1562, Article xxvii, which speaks of Baptism, is expressed in the same words.

As this language is not unequivocal, and therefore susceptible of an interpretation not in full harmony with other Reformed Confessions, we quote the article on *Sin after Baptism*, as indicating the sense in which the language must, be understood.

Art. XVI. *Of Sin after Baptism.* "Not every deadly sin willingly committed after Baptism is sin against the Holy Ghost,

rum prius est Baptismus, nobis testificandae nostrae adoptioni datus, quoniam in eo inserimur Christi corpori, ut ejus sanguine abluti, simul etiam ipsius spiritu ad vitae sanctimoniam renoveramur."

* Art. xxxviii. Dicimus itaque elementum aquae, quantumvis caducum, nobis nihilominus vere testificari interiorum animi nostri ablutionem in sanguine Jesu Christi per sancti spiritus efficaciam."

†21. "Quin potius, certo credimus, per baptismum, nos in Christo Jesu inseri."

and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may arise again, and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned, which say, they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent."

From the Belgic Confession, 1562.

Art. 34. "We believe and confess, that Jesus Christ, who is the end of the law, hath by His own blood-shedding made an end of all other propitiatory sacrifice for sins. Also that Circumcision which was done by blood, being abolished, He hath instituted Baptism in the place thereof; whereby we are received into the Church of God, and separated from all other nations, and all kind of strange religions, being consecrated unto Him alone, whose badge and mark we wear. Finally, Baptism is a token to us that He will be our God forever, who is also our gracious Father. Therefore the Lord hath commanded all his to be baptized with pure water, in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, to signify that the blood of Christ doth internally, through the operation of the Spirit, perform and effect that in the soul, which water doth externally work upon our bodies. For as water, being poured upon us, and appearing on the body of him that is baptized, moistening the same, doth wash away the filthiness of the body; so the blood of Christ, washing the soul, doth cleanse it from sin, and doth change us, who are children of wrath, into sons of God. Not that this material water doth these things; but the sprinkling of the precious blood of the Son of God, which is unto us as the Red Sea, which we must pass through, that we may depart from the tyranny of Pharaoh, that is, the Devil, and enter into the spiritual land of Canaan. Therefore Ministers verily do deliver unto us the Sacrament, and the visible thing; but the Lord Himself giveth unto us that which is represented by the Sacrament, namely, the gifts and invisible graces: washing, purifying and cleansing our souls from

all spots and iniquities ; renewing also and filling our hearts with all comfort ; and giving unto us a certain persuasion of His fatherly goodness, clothing us with the new man, and taking off the old man with all his deeds. Moreover, we believe that every one who desires to obtain eternal life, ought to be baptized with one Baptism, and to be content with this one Baptism, which never afterwards is to be repeated, seeing that we cannot be born twice.

"Neither does this Baptism profit us only at that moment, when the water rests upon us, or when we are sprinkled with it, but throughout the whole time of our life ; otherwise it were necessary that we have the head always sprinkled with water."

From the Heidelberg Catechism, 1563.

Q. 69. "How is it signified and sealed unto thee in Holy Baptism, that thou hast part in the one sacrifice of Christ on the cross ?

Thus : that Christ has appointed this outward washing with water, and has joined therewith this promise, that I am washed with His blood and Spirit from the pollution of my soul, that is, from all my sins, as certainly as I am washed outwardly with water, whereby commonly the filthiness of the body is taken away.

Q. 70. What is it to be washed with the blood and Spirit of Christ ?

It is to have the forgiveness of sins from God, through grace, for the sake of Christ's blood, which He shed for us in His sacrifice on the cross ; and also to be renewed by the Holy Ghost, and sanctified to be members of Christ, that so we may more and more die unto sin, and lead holy and unblamable lives.

Q. 71. Where has Christ promised that we are as certainly washed with His blood and spirit as with the water of Baptism ?

In the institution of Baptism, which runs thus : Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. He

that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. This promise is also repeated, where the Scripture calls Baptism the washing of regeneration, and the washing away of sins.

Q. 72. Is then the outward washing with water itself the washing away of sins?

No; for only the blood of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit cleanse us from all sin.

Q. 73. Why, then, doth the Holy Ghost call Baptism the washing of regeneration, and the washing away of sins?

God speaks thus not without great cause; namely, not only to teach us thereby that like as the filthiness of the body is taken away by water, so also our sins are taken away by the blood and Spirit of Christ; but much more, that by this divine pledge and token He may assure us, that we are as really washed from our sins spiritually, as our bodies are washed with water."

From the Second Helvetic Confession, 1562, 1566.

20. "There is but one Baptism in the Church of God: for it is sufficient to be once baptized or consecrated to God. For Baptism once received doth continue all a man's life, and is a perpetual sealing of our adoption unto us. For to be baptized in the name of Christ, is to be enrolled, introduced, and received into the covenant and family, and so into the inheritance of the sons of God; yea, and in this life to be called after the name of God, that is, to be called a son of God; to be purged also from the filthiness of sins, and endued with the manifold grace of God, unto a new and innocent life. Baptism therefore doth call to mind, and keep in remembrance, the great benefit of God performed to mankind. For we are all born in the pollution of sin, and are the sons of wrath. But God, who is rich in mercy, doth freely purge us from our sins by the blood of His Son, and in Him doth adopt us to be His sons, and by an holy covenant joins us to Himself, and enriches us with divers gifts, that we may live a new life. All these things are sealed in Baptism. For inwardly we are regenerated, purified,

and renewed of God by the Holy Spirit; and outwardly we receive the sealing of most notable gifts by the water, by which also those great benefits are represented, and, as it were, set before our eyes to be looked upon. And therefore are we baptized, that is, washed and sprinkled with visible water. For the water maketh clean that which is filthy, and refresheth and cooleth the bodies that fail and faint. And the grace of God dealeth in like manner with the soul; and that invisibly and spiritually."*

From the Confession of John Sigismund, Margrave of Brandenburg, 1614.

"Of Holy Baptism, the first Sacrament of the New Testament, His Electoral Grace believes and confesses that it is really a bath of new birth and renewal in the Holy Ghost,† and that no one can enter into the kingdom of heaven except he be born again of water and the Spirit; not that the outward water can wash away the sins both of unbelievers and believers, and regenerate them, but that in this holy Sacrament believers are adopted to be children of God, are cleansed from their sins by the blood of Christ and the Holy Ghost, and by this visible sign of the Covenant of grace are as by a certain seal assured of their salvation."

—*Conf. Helv. Posterior XX.* "Unus est duntaxat Baptismus in Ecclesia Dei, et satis est semel baptisari, vel initiari Deo. Durat autem semel susceptus baptismus, per omnem vitam, et est perpetua obsignatio adoptionis nostrae. Etenim baptisari in nomine Christi, est inscribi, initiari, et recipi in foedus, atque familiam, adeoque in haereditatem filiorum Dei, imo jam nunc nuncupari nomine Dei, id est, appellari filium Dei, purgari item a sordibus peccatorum, et donari varia Dei gratia, ad vitam novam et innocentem. Baptismus ergo in memoria retinet, et reparat ingens Dei beneficium, generi mortalius praestitum. Nascimur enim omnes in peccatorum sordibus, et sumus filii irae. Deus autem qui dives est misericordia, purgat nos a peccatis gratuito, per sanguinem filii sui, et in hoc adoptat nos in filios, adeoque fodere sancto nos sibi connectit et variis donis ditat, ut possimus novam vivere vitam. Obsignantur haec omnia baptismo. Nam intus regeneramur, purificamur, et renovamur a Deo per spiritum sanctum: foris autem accipimus obsignationem maximorum donorum, in aqua, qua etiam maxima illa beneficia representantur et veluti oculis nostris conspicendi proponuntur. Ideoque baptisamur, id est, abluiamur, aut aspergimur aqua visibili. Aqua enim sordes mundat, deficiens et aestuans recreat, et refrigerat corpora. Gratia vero Dei haec animabus praestat, et quidem invisibiliter vel spiritualiter."

†"Von der heiligen Tauffe, als dem ersten Sacrament des Neuen Testaments

*From the Confession of Poland, or Declaration of Thorn, 1645.**

“Baptism is a Sacrament of the New Testament, instituted by the Lord Jesus Christ and to be administered by the Minister of the Word, both to infants born in the Church, and to adults coming into the Church by profession of faith, by the washing of water in the name of the Holy Trinity; in order to signify and witness the internal absolution from sins, or the remission of sins, by the blood of Christ, and to effect a renewal, or regeneration, by the Holy Ghost.

“We solemnly declare accordingly that this Sacrament, because itself the appointment of Christ, is altogether necessary, as the ordinary medium of salvation; though we do not affirm that this necessity is so absolute, that whosoever, whether an infant or adult, has departed this life without external Baptism, must in every case, even if it happen without any contempt, be damned. Here rather does this rule especially prevail, that not the want but the contempt of the Sacrament damns.”

From the Westminster Confession of Faith, 1648.

“Baptism is a Sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life; which Sacrament is, by Christ’s own appointment, to be continued in His Church until the end of the world.”

“Although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized, are undoubtedly regenerated.

“The efficacy of Baptism is not tied to that moment of time

glauben und bekennen Seine Churf. Go. dass dieselbe soy wahrhaftig ein Bad der Wiedergeburt und Erneurung im Heiligen Geist.” Conf. Sigismundi.

* Generalis Professio, Doctrinae Ecclesiarum Reformatarum in Regno Poloniae, Magno Ducatu Lithuaniae, annexisque Regni Provinciis, in Conventu Thoruniensi, An. 1645, ad liquidationem Controversiarum maturandam, exhibita. d. 1, Sep.

wherein it is administered ; yet, notwithstanding, by the right use of this ordinance, the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost to such, whether of age or infants, as that grace belongeth unto,* according to the counsel of God's own will, in His appointed time."

From the Larger Catechism.

Q. 165. What is Baptism ?

A. Baptism is a Sacrament of the New Testament, wherein Christ hath ordained the washing with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, to be a sign and seal of ingrafting into Himself, of remission of sins by His blood, and regeneration by His Spirit; of adoption, and resurrection unto everlasting life; and whereby the parties baptized are solemnly admitted into the visible Church, and enter into an open and professed engagement to be wholly and only the Lord's."

Comment and Argument.

Here we have before us, drawn out in full, the explicit teaching of the Reformed Church on the Sacrament of Holy Baptism. These Confessions represent not only Switzerland, France, Germany, Belgium, Poland, England and Scotland, but Holland, Hungary, and every other country or State to which the Reformed Church gained access during the sixteenth century. They extend from the year 1530 to 1648, that is, into the middle of the seventeenth century, thus showing that amid all the civil convulsions, and the philosophical and theological conflicts of the age, the original doctrine lived on in the faith and consciousness of the Church.

In full harmony with the general idea of a Sacrament already given, the Confessions teach that Baptism *consists of two things*: a visible sign and invisible grace ; the visible being water, or an external washing of the body with water ; whilst the invisible is the blood and Spirit of Christ, or the inward cleansing of the

* The *Confession of Faith* limits the saving efficacy of Holy Baptism to those whom "God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to His eternal purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of His will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory." Those who are "fore-ordained to everlasting death" receive no spiritual benefit from the Sacrament.

soul from the pollution of sin and the quickening of the new life in Christ by the Holy Ghost.

The natural element of water is not Baptism; though it is an essential part of the Sacrament. The Confessions attach importance to the washing with water as an indispensable part of the transaction; but always repudiate the notion that the external washing is Holy Baptism proper, or the substance and truth of the Sacrament.

Nor does the forgiveness of sins and regeneration by the blood and Spirit of Christ constitute Baptism. The grace of God in Jesus Christ is indeed the principal part of the Sacrament, but disconnected from the washing with water it is no more entitled to the name of Baptism than is the simple external washing with water itself. Disjoined, neither one is the Sacrament. There is not, on the one hand, a Sacrament of water-baptism, and on the other, a Sacrament of Spirit-baptism. Of such distinction and dualistic opposition there is no trace in any of the Confessions.

Holy Baptism is that divine ordinance in which *these two things are united*. This is either clearly expressed or necessarily implied in all the teachings of the Confessions. In addition to the proofs furnished in support of the general idea of a Sacrament as held by the Reformed Church, we will cite a few passages pertaining to the constitution of Baptism. "This Sacrament consisteth of an outward washing, that is done with water with calling on the name of the Holy Trinity; in order that, of the element and the Word, there may arise, and be jointly made withal, a Sacrament."* "There is in every Sacrament," says the Westminster Confession of Faith, "a spiritual relation, or sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified; whence it comes that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other."† In answer to the Question: What are the parts of a Sacrament? the Larger Catechism answers: "The parts of a Sacrament are two; the one, an outward and sensible sign used according to Christ's own

* Conf. of Bohemia. Chap 12..

† Westminster Confession of Faith. Chap. 27, 2.

appointment; the other, an inward and spiritual grace thereby signified.* The spiritual grace is as really and truly a part of Baptism as the outward sign; and the spiritual grace, according to this same Catechism, is remission of sins by the blood of Christ and regeneration by His spirit.†

On this point Ursinus is very explicit in his *Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism*. "There is in Baptism," he says, "a double water: the one external and visible, which is elementary; the other internal, invisible and heavenly, which is the blood and Spirit of Christ. There is also a double washing in Baptism;‡ the one external, visible and signifying, namely, the sprinkling and pouring with water, which is perceptible by the members and senses of the body; the other internal, invisible and signified, namely, the remission of sins on account of the blood of Christ shed for us, and our regeneration by the Holy Spirit and ingrafting into His body, which is spiritual, and perceived only by faith and the Spirit."§ Now, bearing in mind that in his *Theses concerning Sacraments in general*, he maintains that "the things signified are always received in connection with the signs in the lawful use of the Sacraments," there can be no doubt as to his true meaning. Nor can there be any doubt as to the doctrine taught by the Heidelberg Catechism, when it affirms that "I am washed with His blood and Spirit from the pollution of my soul, that is, from all my sins, as certainly as I am washed outwardly with water."

* Larger Catechism. Q. 163.

† Larger Catechism. Q. 165.

‡ "Baptism comprehends these three things:

1. The sign, which is water and the ceremony connected with it.
2. The things which are signified thereby, which are the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, the mortification of the old man, and the quickening of the new man.
3. The command and promise of Christ, from which the sign obtains its authority and power to confirm." Williard's Ursinus, p. 357.

In this analytical definition, as it may be called, Ursinus teaches positively that the quickening of the new man is as really a part of Baptism as the outward washing with water. The three things specified are each an essential part of the Sacrament.

* This is the word used in Parry's translation.

§ Williard's Ursinus, p. 372, 4th Thesis on Baptism.

The union of spiritual cleansing and regeneration with the outward washing with water, is not natural, nor local, but mystical. It is established by the Word of Christ in the original institution of Baptism. The Word of Christ thus connecting the spiritual and the natural is of force always, not effectual only in the moment when He spoke the Word, but effectual for all time.* When a Minister of Christ administers the solemn rite in the name of the Holy Trinity, thus repeating by His authority His own words, the baptismal transaction is no less divine than human; an internal saving act of Christ by His own Word and Spirit, no less than an external act by His Minister. "Christ baptizes us by the hand of His Ministers, just as He speaks through them."†

It is of this mystical union of the cleansing and regenerating power of Christ by His Spirit with the outward washing with water, that the *objective efficacy* of Baptism is predicated. Not of the outward washing with water simply. "Not that this material water doth these things."‡ Calvin asks: "Do you think that the water is the bath of the soul?" and then answers: "By no means."§ In like manner, the Heidelberg Catechism denies that the outward washing with water is itself the washing away of sins.

Nor is the objective saving efficacy predicated of the blood and Spirit of Christ separately taken; as if any person refusing to be baptized, might apply directly to Christ and obtain from Him by His Spirit the assurance of the forgiveness of sins, without the intervention of Holy Baptism. As we said before of the general doctrine of a Sacrament, so now we say of this particular doctrine, that there is in the Reformed Confessions no trace of the theory of abstract saving grace, now so extensively prevalent among our American Churches, as must be evi-

* "For we believe that the Baptism of the Church, which is but one, was sanctified in God's first institution of it, and is consecrated with the Word, and is now of full force, by and for the first blessing of God upon it." Latter Confession of Helvetia. Chap. 20.

† Williard's Ursinus. Page 372.

‡ Belgian Conf. Art 34.

§ Gen. Cat. V. De Sac.

dent to any unprejudiced mind that will carefully examine the extracts which we have embodied in this Article. The Confessions nowhere recognize the notion that a sinner may reject or neglect the sign, and yet possess the thing signified; that he may refuse the external washing with water, and yet receive the inward cleansing by the Spirit. On the contrary to be baptized is a first and positive duty, imposed by the direct command of Christ, and incumbent unconditionally upon all to whom the Gospel is proclaimed. Those who refuse to comply with His command commit sin against Christ, and persist in sinning against Him so long as they refuse.*

The Confessions are very careful to draw a broad line of distinction between the visible sign and the invisible grace, between the outward washing with water and the inward cleansing of the Spirit. Just as clearly do they discriminate between the efficacy of the two parts. Whilst the power of spiritual cleansing is denied of natural water, it is affirmed only of the blood and Spirit of Christ. On this point, the Heidelberg Catechism expresses unequivocally the opinion common to all the Reformed Confessions. To the question: "Is then the outward washing with water itself the washing away of sins?" the answer is given, "No; for only the blood of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit can cleanse from all sin." Says the Confession of Belgium: "The truth of our Sacraments is Jesus Christ, without whom they are of no value;" and the Confession of France: "The whole substance and truth of the outward signs is in Christ Jesus; from whom if they be separated they be nothing else but vain shadows and smoke." The saving efficacy of Baptism is not in natural water, but belongs exclusively to the Spirit of Christ; and the subject derives no spiritual benefit from external washing, but only from the regenerating power of the Holy Ghost.

* "They, therefore, which contemn these Sacraments, and through stubbornness will not suffer them to be of any force with themselves, and making small account of them, do esteem them as trifles, or do otherwise abuse them, contrary to the institution, will, or commandment of Christ; all these do grievously sin against the Author thereof, who hath instituted them, and make a very great hazard of their salvation." Confession of Bohemia. Chap. 2.

If we interpret such language in the light of the modern theory of Baptism, a theory which the Confessions deny and reject, it may easily be perverted, and be made to convey a meaning which seems to support the notion of abstract saving grace. Such an interpretation, however, would do violence to the theory of a Sacrament which the Reformed Confessions affirm most explicitly, as well as to the logical connection of the language. If anything be certain beyond the shadow of a doubt, it is that Baptism, according to all the Confessions, is the mystical conjunction of the blood and Spirit of Christ with the outward washing with water, established and perpetuated through all time by the Word of God, which conjunction or union is so real that the sign takes the name of the thing signified, and so essential that either one part without the other, the sign without the thing signified, or the thing signified without the sign, would not be Baptism.

But if the broad distinction which the Confessions draw between the natural water and the work of the Spirit, denying saving efficacy of the one and affirming it only of the other, be understood in the light of their own idea of Baptism, this distinction will be seen to be both important and necessary; for it is made, not to deny objective efficacy of Holy Baptism proper, nor to affirm that salvation from sin and regeneration are effected by the Holy Spirit independently of this Sacrament; but in order to deny cleansing and quickening virtue of the outward washing separately considered, and to affirm that these spiritual blessings are conferred by the blood and Spirit of Christ as the thing signified and really present and operative in the sacramental transaction.

The Confessions teach accordingly that *we receive forgiveness of sins, and are born again of the Spirit, through the Sacrament of Baptism.* As this is a turning point in the question, let us briefly review the evidence.

“And as the Lord is the author of the Sacraments, so he continually worketh in that Church where they are rightly used; so that the faithful, when they receive them of the Ministers do know that *the Lord worketh in his own ordi-*

nance, and therefore they receive them as from the hand of God." "Inwardly we are regenerated, purified, and renewed of God through the Holy Spirit, and outwardly we receive the sealing of most notable gifts by the water." Latter Helvetic Confession, Chap. 19, 20.

"In Baptism water is the sign, and the thing itself is regeneration, and adoption among the people of God." Former Helvetic Confession, Art. 20. "Baptism is a Sacrament *whereby the Lord doth regenerate us*, and cleanse us from our sins." Declaration of the same Confession.

"For we confess * that these outward signs are such, that *God* by the power of His Holy Spirit, *doth work by them*, that nothing may be there represented in vain." "In Baptism we are ingrafted into Christ's body." Gallican Confession, Art. 84, 85.

"We believe certainly, that, *through Baptism*, we are ingrafted into Jesus Christ." Conf. of Scotland.

"It is certain that both the pardon of sins, and the new life are *offered to us*, and *received by us, in Baptism*." Geneva Catechism by Calvin.

"By the Sacraments, as by certain means, God Himself worketh within us, through the power of the Holy Ghost." "The Lord hath commanded all his to be baptized with pure water, to signify that the blood of Christ doth internally, through the operation of the Spirit, perform and effect that in the soul, which water doth externally work upon our bodies." Belgic Confession.

"To be baptized in the name of Christ, is to be purged from the filthiness of sins, and endued with the manifold grace of God, unto a new and innocent life." Latter Helvetic Conf.

"By the right use of this ordinance the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost." Westminster Confession of Faith.

These citations might easily be multiplied. But it is scarcely

¹ "Fatemur enim, talia esse signa haec exteriora, ut Deus per illa, sancti sui spiritus virtute, operetur, ne quicquam ibi frustra nobis significetur. Conf. Fidei Gall. Art. xxxiv.

necessary. Those given are so clear, direct and unequivocal, especially when taken together, and in connection with the entire doctrine of the Confessions relatively to the Sacraments, that there is no room for two opinions. Through all of them runs the same general idea, namely, that God forgives our sins, and communicates a new and spiritual life by the Holy Ghost through the Sacrament of Holy Baptism. In some the doctrine is defined on all sides dialectically, and with so much perspicuity and force that it stands in the firmament of the Reformed Church as distinctly as the sun in the heavens. In others, it is not taught so explicitly, because there is either no reference to opposing Romish, Anabaptistic or Rationalistic errors, or the opposition between the truth and various errors is not so nicely and formally defined; but the doctrine, as we have stated it, underlies and pervades every Confession.

There are *two points* more that require consideration.

In order to complete a correct view of the Reformed doctrine of Baptism, it is important not to confound its objective efficacy with its subjective efficacy. Though these philosophic terms do not occur in the Confessions, yet the facts which these terms designate are very carefully distinguished. The objective efficacy is the divine power belonging to, and inherent in, the constitution of Baptism itself, irrespectively of the use or abuse of the Sacrament by men. The subjective efficacy is this same power actualized in the conversion, sanctification, and the final complete salvation of the subjects of Baptism. All of us make the same distinction in regard to the Word of God. The Word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword (Heb. v. 12.). There is divine power in the Word itself, whether men receive it or reject it. This is its objective efficacy. But the preaching of the Word may issue in the personal salvation, or the personal damnation, of those that hear it, according as they receive it in true faith, or reject it in unbelief. The subjective efficacy of the preached Word does not depend exclusively on the Word itself; but depends also on the will of men. What the Word is in itself, it is and ever will be, whether the millions who hear it are finally saved, or but

hundreds. The same distinction is to be made in regard to the Sacrament of Baptism.

Now the Reformed Confessions teach that the *objective efficacy* of Baptism is *unconditional*. What it is in itself does not depend on the worthiness or moral character of the officiating minister, nor upon the worthiness or moral character of the persons baptized. The washing with water becomes a Sacrament by the Word of God, not by the word of man. As its intrinsic power is not derived from the piety of the minister, so neither can this power be diminished or affected by his want of piety.

So the Confessions teach. "As we esteem not the goodness of the Sacrament by the worthiness or unworthiness of the Ministers, so likewise we do not weigh them by the condition of the receivers. For we know that the goodness of the Sacraments doth depend upon the faithfulness, or truth, or mere goodness of God. For even as God's Word remaineth the true Word of God; wherein not only bare words are uttered when it is preached, but therewithal the things signified by the words are offered of God, although the wicked and unbelievers hear and understand the words, yet enjoy not the things signified, because they receive them not by a true faith; even so, the Sacraments, consisting of the Word, the signs, and the things signified, continue true and perfect Sacraments, not only because they be holy things, but also for that God also offereth the things, howsoever the unbelievers receive not the things which are offered. This cometh to pass, not by any fault in God, the author and offerer of them; but by the fault of men, who do receive them without faith, and unlawfully; whose unbelief cannot make the truth of God of none effect, Rom. iii: 3." Latter Helvetic Confession, Chap. 19.

"Seeing that the institution and work of the Word and of the Sacraments proceed not from men, but from God; we do here reject the error of the Donatists and Anabaptists, who esteemed the holy gifts of God according to the worthiness and unworthiness of the minister." Declaration of the Former Helyetic Confession.

These quotations from the two Swiss Confessions express clearly the Reformed view concerning the objective constitution of Baptism. By the Word of God the efficacious grace of Christ is joined unconditionally to the washing with natural water in the Sacrament. We say *unconditionally* relatively to men. The will of men, the character of men, is not a condition of the constitution of Baptism. The only condition is the Word and power of Christ working by the Holy Ghost. The Word has been spoken. The sacred mystery is established, and is continued with all its original force perennially, from age to age, by the ever living power of the Word in the Church.

The officiating Minister may be unworthy. He may administer the Sacrament without a due sense of its great solemnity. But his unworthiness does not change the Sacrament into something that is not proper Baptism; nor does it limit or diminish its efficacy or force as a grace-bearing ordinance.

Nor does the character of the subject affect its objective constitution and efficacy. Whether it be Paul or Simon Magus that is baptized, the Sacrament in itself is the same. The subject is introduced into the covenant of grace, and made a member of the Church of Christ. Baptism is and remains always the sign and seal of divine grace, just as the Word is the same power of God whether Paul proclaims it to Timothy or to Felix. Or just as natural birth makes the child a member of the family, and invests it with all the rights of a child, whether as it grows up it honors father and mother, or dishonors them.

But the subjective efficacy of baptism is *not unconditional*. Whether or not Baptism issue in a godly life and eternal salvation, depends also on the will and character of the subject. A baptized person must recognize and improve the grace conferred in Baptism. This he may fail to do. Like the prodigal son, he may leave his Father's house, and waste his inheritance in riotous living. Or like Esau, he may sell his birth-right for a mess of pottage. Simon Magus, after receiving Baptism, was in the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity. Ananias and Saphira were baptized and celebrated the holy Eucharist,

but they lied to the Holy Ghost, and were punished with instantaneous death. These being dead branches on the true Vine, are cut off and cast into the fire.

Baptismal grace does not constrain the will of man as by an external force. He is free to choose between good and evil. He may yield, and particularly if rightly instructed, he is predisposed to yield, to the constraining power of the Holy Ghost given him in Baptism, repent and believe, follow Christ, and ultimately attain to the resurrection of the dead. Or he may abuse the grace he possesses. He may resist the constraining power of the Spirit, live in sin and wickedness, and inherit everlasting punishment. Just as the hearer of the Word may close his heart against its penetrating power, shut his eyes to the light of truth, and live on in worldliness, vanity and sin. Or just as a son, possessing all the advantages of Christian parentage, of high social position, and liberal education, may nevertheless disobey his father and mother, follow the tendencies of a perverse will, serve the lusts of the flesh, and become an outcast from society.

There is no conflict or inconsistency between these two things, either in fact or logically. The Confessions teach both with equal clearness. Whilst the objective efficacy is *unconditional*, the subjective efficacy is *conditional*. In the Genevan Catechism, in answer to the question: "Is this grace bestowed on all indiscriminately?" Calvin says: "As many by their wickedness shut up the way to it, they make it of no effect for themselves. Therefore the fruit comes to none but to believers only. Yet for this reason nothing is abated of the nature of Baptism."* The essential nature and objective efficacy of the Sacrament are unaffected by those who receive baptismal grace in vain. It is only through the repentance and faith of the baptized that this grace issues in an actual Christian life and experience. For want of repentance and faith, though Baptism does not fail to fulfil its office, many make it

"Multi dum illa sua pravitate viam præcludunt, efficiunt, ut sibi sit inanis. Ita non nisi ad fidèles solos penerint fructus. Verum, inde nihil Sacramenti naturas dedidit." Catech. Genev. De Sac.

of no effect for themselves. They do not possess the fruit. They abuse the grace conferred on them. Members of the family of God, its spiritual blessings all sealed to them, possessing the Holy Spirit, and entitled to all the grace needful in order to overcome the power of sin, conquer the world and the devil, and attain to a resurrection in the likeness of the Redeemer, they yet fail to realize the end of baptismal grace, because they ignore their filial relation to their Heavenly Father, despise the spiritual blessings sealed to them, grieve the Holy Spirit working in them, and resist the grace by which they have been apprehended.

This abuse of baptismal grace does not annul the objective nature, efficacy, and design of Holy Baptism. That, we repeat, is unaffected by their wickedness. In itself and in its relations it is the same divine institution and divine transaction.

Nor, on the other hand, does baptismal grace destroy the moral nature of men. Because God, in the Baptismal act, translates the subject from the sphere of fallen nature into the real kingdom of grace present on earth, it does not follow that he, though chosen of God, must not also choose Christ himself, and live in His service faithfully to the end, in order to be saved; nor does it follow that he can choose Christ and persevere in His service without a free act of his own will. He is qualified and disposed, by the possession of divine grace, both to resolve to follow Christ, and to carry out his resolution steadily against all opposition; which implies, however, that he is able also not to resolve thus to follow Christ. More than this. He is not only able not to resolve to follow Christ, but, as his old, fallen nature is not yet extinct, but only in process of total destruction, he is ever in real danger, though engrafted into Christ by the Spirit, of falling away from Christ through the allurements of the world and the assaults of the devil, and being lost. Baptism renders salvation possible; it puts the baptized person in a state of grace, a position in which he can watch and pray, worship God acceptably, be nourished by the body and blood of the Lord, grow in faith and knowledge, and fight against sin and Satan in the full armor of the Gospel.

But it does not make salvation from sin certain unconditionally. It does not remove the danger of failure. It does not impose upon the baptized person the necessity of becoming an earnest Christian and persevering in the Christian life. He is not forced to walk in the way of actual salvation. Otherwise a man would no longer be a free moral being.

Yet the possibility of salvation is real. If the baptized person will but surrender himself from the heart to his Saviour, and remain faithful to his calling unto death, baptismal grace will be consummated in his resurrection from the dead and his entrance into the perfect state of glory. The subjective conditions being met, the life everlasting is as undoubted and certain as the fact of Baptism.

Without baptism this real possibility does not exist. According to the established economy of grace, he only enters into the kingdom who believes the gospel and is baptized.

This relation of Baptism to the baptized, the Confessions, as we have seen, compare to the relation which the preaching of the Word bears to the hearers, and illustrate the one by the other. The preaching of the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to all those that believe. Divine power is inherent in the Word. But the hearer is not forced to receive it. If he remain in unbelief and sin, it does not follow that the Word is not a divine power in itself. The practical effect of the Word is conditional, but its objective force is unconditional.

But we may illustrate the same idea by an analogous fact in human life. A young man may be endowed with extraordinary powers of mind, qualifying him to become a profound scholar, an eminent author, a prominent statesman, or a great artist. Yet he may not become either one or the other. The real possibilities of his genius may never be realized.* To become in fact what he is potentially, he needs opportunity or occasion, education, and above all things, a will to act. Wanting in these, particularly in will, he may live and die as though, for all practical purposes at least, he were not thus endowed.

*The beautiful lines of Thomas Gray, in his celebrated Elegy, naturally suggest themselves:

Because endowed with extraordinary natural powers, it does not follow, necessarily, that he will become an eminent and influential man. This result is conditional. It depends upon himself.

Nor does it follow, because he fails to attain to eminence and distinction, that he is not more highly endowed than the majority of men. What he is by natural birth, is unconditional. It does not depend upon himself, not upon opportunity or education, not upon his will.

So is a man born into the kingdom of Heaven by the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, endowed with divine grace, which is the new life in Christ Jesus. He is a babe in Christ. As such, there is in him the real possibility of a complete normal development of spiritual life, including the fruits of the Spirit, the resurrection from the dead, and glorification with Christ in Heaven. But as he is a person, neither a machine nor an animal, this actual result depends upon tuition and discipline, but mainly upon his own will and intelligence. Whilst God works in him both to will and to do, he must also work out his own salvation with fear and trembling, (Phil. ii, 12.) Therefore he may fail to become, in fact, in the kingdom of Heaven what he is potentially, in virtue of his new birth of the Spirit; just as the design of God may never be realized when He endows a person, by natural birth, with the powers of genius.

Hence it does not follow that a person must be saved because he is born of the Spirit in Holy Baptism; just as a man must not rival the greatness of Napoleon or Washington, Homer or Shakspeare, because by nature a genius.

Nor does it follow that a person is not really born of the Spirit into the kingdom of Heaven by Baptism, because he lives in sin, and is lost; just as we cannot infer that a man is not by nature a genius, merely because he accomplishes nothing that is great and good, and lives in obscurity and vice.

The parallel is valid. The kingdom of grace is an order of

"Some village Hampden, that with dauntless breast,
The little tyrant of his fields withstood;
Some mute, inglorious Milton here may rest,
Some Cromwell guiltless of his country's blood."

life as real as the kingdom of nature. Natural birth is not a theory, not abstract doctrine, not a mere emotional process, but it is the real beginning of concrete natural life, comprehending body and soul. So is the new birth of the Spirit not a theory, not an invisible ideal transaction, but a transition from nature to grace, as real as the transition from the womb of the mother into the sphere of individual existence, and is therefore the real beginning of a new concrete spiritual life, which comprehends the body as well as the soul, and completes itself in the resurrection, as fallen natural life completes itself in death and the grave. In both we are passive. A child is begotten and born by the antecedent law and powers of nature. It is re-begotten and reborn by the antecedent law and powers of the Holy Ghost in the Church. Yet so soon as born it is met by the conditions of the ethical world. The design of natural birth will be realized if these conditions are met. So soon as reborn it is met by the conditions of the ethical world as these obtain in the sphere of grace. And if these conditions of grace are met, the design of the new birth of water and the Spirit will be realized in complete salvation.

The difficulty of appreciating the force of this analogy arises from the prevalence of a false idealistic habit of thought. Evangelical theology, so-called, has little or no faith in the reality of the Church, or in the reality of regeneration. Regeneration is regarded as merely a subjective change, a change in the general habit of feeling, thought, and of the will, produced by the Holy Ghost through the preaching of Bible doctrines, instead of a new creation in Christ, involving the entire man. And the will of God is regarded rather as an outside, immutable, mechanical force, than as a living, concrete, ethical power. So soon as the Church is seen to be a constitution more real than the constitution of nature, the birth of the Spirit to be more real and comprehensive than the birth of the flesh, and the new life in the second Adam to be more real than the old life in the first Adam, the difficulty disappears, and the analogy has the force of an argument as well as that of an illustration.

We do not wish to imply that the Confessions adopt this analogy. They confine themselves to a comparison of Baptism to the Word. We have added it in order to show that the Reformed doctrine is sustained and illustrated by the analogy of natural life no less than by that of the preaching of the gospel.

There are still two other points involved in the results of our inquiry that require elucidation. One relates to a false interpretation of the sixty-fifth question of the Heidelberg Catechism, which teaches that the Holy Ghost works faith in our hearts by the preaching of the gospel, and confirms it by the use of the Sacraments. The other is the difference between the Reformed doctrine of Baptism, and the *opus operatum* theory of the Roman Catholic Church. But as our investigation has already exceeded its intended limits, we waive the consideration of them, at least for the present.

CONCLUSION.

As stated at the outset, it has been our design to ascertain what is the Reformed doctrine concerning Holy Baptism, from a full and thorough examination of the Confessions of the Reformed Church.

It was not our design to show that the Reformed doctrine is in full accord with the doctrine as held during the first three or four centuries of the Church, or as taught in the New Testament. On these points we neither affirm, nor deny, nor imply anything. They lie beyond the range of our inquiry.

Nor do we wish to imply that the Reformed dogma is perfect; that the Church of the present, and the future, is slavishly bound to hold and teach neither more nor less than the Reformed Church of the sixteenth century held and taught; or that there is no room nor occasion for further progress in the knowledge of the truth concerning the Sacrament of Baptism; and that as psychological, exegetical and theological science advances in the order of legitimate development, informed by living faith in the incarnate Word, and guided by the light of history, the Protestant Church may not attain to a conception of Holy Baptism that will answer more fully to the New Testament idea than any that meets us in existing Confessions.

These points we do not touch. Nor is any view we may take of these questions inconsistent either with our design, or with the result of our investigation.

The simple and only question now before us is: what was the prevailing view of Baptism in the Reformed Church of the sixteenth century? That view we have drawn from the Reformed Confessions themselves, the most authoritative and satisfactory sources of information.

They teach as with one voice, that Holy Baptism, being the union by the power of the Word, of the thing signified with the sign, is the Sacrament of Regeneration; that in and through Baptism we receive forgiveness of sins, are ingrafted into Christ, and are thus made partakers of a new spiritual life by the power of the Holy Ghost; and that no one can have the assurance of sins forgiven, and peace with God, or can enter into the kingdom of Heaven, who refuses to be baptized.

This is the *Protestant* doctrine. It is the doctrine of the *Reformed* Church in all its branches. Nor is it contradicted by a single acknowledged formulary of faith.

Modern evangelical theology denies and repudiates this doctrine of the Reformed Church. It denies that Baptism is the Sacrament of Regeneration. It denies that there is an inward and necessary connection, effected by the Word of God, of the blood and Spirit of Christ, which is the thing signified, with the outward washing with consecrated water, which is the sign. It denies that in Baptism we are really ingrafted into Christ by the Holy Ghost, and thus have forgiveness of sins, and a new spiritual life, comprehending the entire man. This is to deny that Christ is true to Himself in His own living Institution; or that He really does by His spirit what He signifies by the outward transaction; and virtually resolves the Sacrament into a lifeless form, and an empty ceremony.

By such denial, modern evangelical theology shakes hands with the old anabaptistic heresy of the Reformation period, which the Reformed Confessions with one accord denounce; and convicts itself of being non-protestant and anti-protestant, non-reformed and anti-reformed. It affirms, in regard to Baptism, what the Reformed Confessions in most explicit terms

deny, and denies what they most solemnly affirm; yet plumes itself on this open hostility to the old faith, as being the badge of uncompromising fidelity to the Protestant Church.

Upon the unbelieving spirit that sees in Holy Baptism only an empty and ineffectual sign, and thus turns the acts of Jesus Christ into pantomime, the entire Reformed Church of the sixteenth century joins with the Confession of Scotland in pronouncing the condemnatory sentence: *Itaque vanitatem eorum, qui affirmant, sacramenta nil aliud quam mera et nuda signa esse, omnino damnamus.*

ART. III.—GERMANIA.

BY SAMUEL V. MAYS, A. M., PHILADELPHIA.

“*Omnia Roma cum pretio*” became a fact in the history of the Imperial City, and with the departure of her virtue, integrity and character, the sovereignty of the world passed from her forever. Almost simultaneously with the advent of Christianity, and destined to become the true element of its development, a new people sprang into existence. A simple religion on the one hand, came forward to sweep away the magnificent creations of intellect and fancy; on the other, the forests of Central Europe sent forth their hordes of barbarians to assume the control of temporal affairs. The two met and moved on together, and a regeneration of the world began. The Sun of Antiquity set, and the night of the Middle Ages covered the world, but it was the darkness which precedes the brightness of the coming day.

Without any clearly-defined geographical limits, Germania was the name given by the ancient Romans to that part of northern and central Europe inhabited by many tribes under different governments, but whose similarity of feature, language and custom, proclaimed them all of the same race. Their first

appearance commonly dates about a century before the Christian era, but it was not until the Roman Empire had seen the world stoop before the throne of her Cæsars, that "She of the Danube and the Northern Seas" arose to perform her allotted part. Dazzled with the glory of Rome, attractive even in her degradation, it is difficult for us at first to reconcile ourselves with the immediate consequences of the migration of the Northern nations. Yearly the Nile overflows its banks, but as its waters return to their accustomed channel and luxuriant vegetation covers the plain, the only means that can save Egypt from a burning waste, are found to have been deposited by this apparent calamity. No less beneficial to society was that flood, which, issuing from Germania, changed ancient civilization, the work of Grecian mind and Roman arms, into semi-barbarism. In its desolating course it deposited the seeds of a new life.

Germania is not a continuation of the previous order of history—Rome, Greece, Persia, India and China. These were, so to speak, the steps of society in a certain direction, but with Rome the limit of that course was reached. The introduction of the Teutonic nations broke the link, not abruptly, but still completely, and changed that course. Henceforth society advances under new influences, and the Middle Ages form the transition period of the Ancient Historical world into the Modern.

As the German *spirit* differed fundamentally from those preceding, so also the manner of its introduction differed from all previous conquests. The subjugation of a foreign power by Rome's legions was immediately followed by a complete system of law, determined in no degree by the institutions it displaced, and with no other end than to direct the resources of the conquered people to the advancement of the Imperial City. Germania had no distinct and established form of government to extend, nor even a political centre whence radiated law, and to which could be directed the fruits of the conquest. She was rather an element introduced into, and assimilated by a decaying society for its reorganization. In fact, she can be said to exist only so far as she comes into contact with foreign nations.

Her history only commences from the time she loses her name. Her *spirit* was the plastic power that developed a new historical era; hence the *universality* of its genius and the absence of any complete system of polity.

What now is the distinguishing feature of this *spirit* of History? True Liberty: not that freedom from restraint which obtains among savages in the absence of established government, but the recognition of the individual, with inalienable rights and privileges, anterior to, and the great object and end of the State. This principle never appears in the ancient social system. On the contrary, under every form of government, the citizen exists only as the property of the State. The elections on the Campus Martius and the Senate Chamber, resonant with the eloquence of the Conscription Fathers, were not the means by which the individual maintained his rights. Senatus Populusque Romanus received the homage of three continents, but in all its splendid triumphs, the Roman finds his only boast in the glory of her, for whose advancement his freedom was sacrificed. Athens, synonym for refinement and superiority in literature and art, Sparta, forever an example of patriotic self-devotion and by-word for virtue, are the desperate struggles for the same end. The oligarchy became a democracy, but the *δῆμος* were still slaves to the very power they wielded. Even here the necessity of the State demanded the institution of ostracism, which took away whatever of freedom a share in the government bestowed on the citizen. The history of Sparta shows the true development of the ancient spirit divested of all the magnificence, and the attractive forms which surround it in the Roman Republic.

In the latter, there is much that bears the semblance of real liberty, but examine it carefully and this likeness vanishes. Did the Licinian Rogations, called forth by the necessary conflict between two classes, virtually abolishing all differences between Plebeian and Patrician, and extending to the former an equal share of political power, become the source of as much freedom as the summoning of the "three estates of France by Phillip the Fair," or the "Mad Parliament" of Simon de

Montfort, which proved the germ of the English House of Commons? The Empire followed the Republic naturally, for the Tribunes and Consuls were nourished by the same meat on which Great Caesar fed. Beautiful and stately was the temple of Roman liberty, but its priests burned on its altars strange fires, unchanged through Kingdom, Republic and Empire.

Ancient History has the form, but not the essence of liberty. To supply this, to abolish the idea that great wealth and power of the State, whether obtained by foreign conquest or internal servitude, was the object of society, to make individual prosperity that object, in short, to reverse the whole ancient order, this was the work of Germania. To this work she brought no stores of knowledge, no traditions of mighty deeds, no discoveries in science and art, but each warrior, as he left that "northern hive," carried within himself principles of freedom guarantied by custom and nourished by his religion, which were as necessary to him as the air he breathed, and which he infused into every society he entered.

That which preserved the primitive independence of the German as well in his native forests as in his absorption by the Roman world, was the influence of nobility, religion and custom. The Roman Historian, in a few short chapters, gives their general character in the picture he offers for the emulation of his countrymen. We see in these Annals the brightest civil and domestic virtues shining forth with increased lustre from amid their barbarous surroundings, a simplicity of character and independence of spirit combined with unity of feeling and sentiment, a strong and unyielding idea of honor, a bravery that looked alike upon victory and death, and, above all, the rude outlines of a system of polity without the panoply of power based upon the freest theory of representative government. These were the germs, surrounded indeed by much that is offensive to civilized society, which under foreign influence developed into all that we admire and cherish in the social institutions of the present day.

This development, or the growth of Germania, manifests itself under two distinct forms. German institutions on the Conti-

ment, and German institutions in England, though starting from the same source, diverge in their expansion, until their kindred can hardly be recognized. German nobility, religion and custom were present in both forms, but led to different results.

While the nobility received all honor and influence, it was honor and influence gained only by merit and subject to certain conditions. There was a mutual dependence between chief and follower which was founded on individual freedom. Feudalism, its direct result in history, clearly proves this. The relation of lord and vassal, though drawing oppression and slavery in its train, was the first step of society from the strong central power of Rome towards true liberty. Feudalism strengthened the principles of private right, because its very life arose from them. Henceforth the existence of the individual *had to be recognized* by the State. The aristocracy of modern European society is not then a continuation of the Patrician order, but is clearly of Germanic origin, and as such was necessary to the growth of freedom.

The religion of the whole Teutonic race, with all its mystic rites and ceremonies, its savage character in strange contrast with the refinement of Grecian mythology, nourished the same spirit of individual freedom. There was no Jupiter Stator, protecting deity of some particular nation, no angry Juno, cherishing a lasting resentment against the rival of her favorite, but Odin, warrior God, sat at his festal board, and welcomed each brave warrior from the battle-field to the pleasures of Walhalla. But this religion exerted its influence only until the northern nations came into contact with the Roman world. Then Christianity superseded it, and in the light of its doctrines the genius of the German *spirit* unfolded and assumed universal sway.

The corresponding relation between Christianity and the Christian Church on the one hand and Germania on the other, was absolutely necessary in the reformation of the world. They formed a complete whole, and without either, the great plan of universal history would have been imperfect. Christianity (the

soul of the religion as distinct from the temporal institution, the Christian Church of the Middle Ages), while it transformed and civilized the German element in common with all mankind, at the same time gave to its peculiar ideas of liberty a new life. It sanctified those principles which ruled among the barbarous nations of the North, rendering them imperishable and all-powerful in the history of the world.

That, however, which more immediately affected the organization of society after the downfall of the Roman Empire, was German custom. Customs were the laws, not written on tables, the work of legislative assemblies or the arbitrary decrees of some powerful chief, but the generally-received methods of administering public affairs and private justice as common sense and their ideas of equity dictated. This was all that confronted the wisdom of ages, the combined product of Grecian and Roman mind. Here stood the *Justinian Code*, replete with learning and surrounded with the majestic form of authority; there were a few traditions of savage origin, but of matchless intrinsic value. In such an unequal contest we cannot expect to see immediately the full extent to which the new spirit influenced existing institutions. Just and equitable as German customs were, grounded on a world wide basis and meeting an approving response in every human heart, they had still much to acquire, and many changes to undergo before they could become practical in their new sphere. In fact, to the degree that institutions were deep-seated and fixed, Germania yielded, and those countries which had been thoroughly Romanized received comparatively little of the form of German polity.

The first definite results during the fifth and sixth centuries, the Salic, Burgundian, Ripuarian and Visigothic laws plainly evince their barbaric origin, but at the same time already show the latinizing tendency of the Christian Church—that living bond between the two conflicting principles. Popular legislative assemblies became less frequent; the unequal distribution of the fruits of the conquest created new centres of attraction, which increased in strength by constant accession; the stronger became still stronger by the absorption of the weaker; the in-

dividual liberty of Germania found itself gradually losing power until it almost disappeared. Conditioned as society then was, this in a certain measure was unavoidable. That spirit of independence, which, in the narrow confines of its early home was checked into moderation by necessity, would undoubtedly have culminated in anarchy and misrule while revelling in the profuse bounties of nature which met the barbarians on their entrance into the fruitful plains of Southern Europe. Here then is the proper place of the temporal power of the Christian Church. She formed the bridge over the vast gulf between Rome and Germania, between Ancient and Modern History. Contradictory as it may seem, she preserved the German spirit and prepared it for society. Independent of her aid, the invasion of the German tribes would have destroyed without affording the means of reconstruction. Wonderful and mighty were the deeds of that sword granted by God to the Pope, "die Christenheit zu beschirme," but centuries ago its work was accomplished, and now in the twilight of its departed glory wanders Pio Nono, grasping after the fleeting shadows of vanished greatness, while the thunders of the Vatican fall harmless on the great adversary of his domains, Victor Emanuel.

While European society in its internal existence experienced the gradual union of German custom with Roman law, its external life suffered corresponding changes. The great monarchies founded by the German nations during the fifth and sixth centuries endured but a short time. There was nothing fixed and firm, but a constant ebb and flow as the mighty waves settled to their proper level. This level is almost gained when the diffused German element is combined in the Frankish Empire of Charlemagne. The transformation of this element had now become complete, and though during its period of education much that was desirable perished, yet it succeeded in disenthraling man and establishing society on a new basis. The dissolution of the Empire of Charlemagne marks the beginning of distinct nationalities which the Crusades render still more distinct. The modern nations, France, Spain and Germany,

begin to determine themselves. In the growth of these nations we see how far the German spirit rules.

Under the protection of the Clergy, Roman law retained its position against many customs which were almost indispensable to the rapid development of free constitutions. The States General, the Cortez, the Diet, all representative legislative bodies with more or less power, while the result of the spirit of liberty, were still too much invested with the remains of the ancient system to admit of a free expansion. Though slow, the growth of this spirit is undoubted. France, first kingdom, then republic, now empire, has witnessed the most violent struggles against power, and now, in spite of its name, the government of Napoleon III. is more limited by conceded popular rights, more determined by the popular will and wants of the individual, than was ever experienced even under the rule of the twelve hundred. Spain, as if still under the spell of Moorish enchantment, forgets in her sleep her primitive glory and her noble origin. From the ruins of the German empire—the effect of the unrestrained license of her ancient independence—starts Austria, proud and tyrannical, but even she cannot resist the march towards freedom, and the reorganization of her government in 1861, with its two houses of parliament, opens a fair prospect to the conglomerate elements of her nationality. The extension of the electorate of Brandenburg by Frederick William, and its subsequent rise to the first rank of nations under him (who, during a seven years war, a century ago, fought summer campaigns against combined Europe, skirmished with the French wits in winter, and in 1864 suffered apotheosis at the hands of Carlyle), the free kingdom of Prussia bears the fullest development of German custom on the Continent. Constitutional monarchy, power on the one hand clearly defined and checked, with every means of self-extension removed, but fully conscious of its true source and dependence; on the other, a new relation of the subject to the sovereign, invested indeed with much of the old tyrannical spirit, but having in its nature the principles of growth, the interests of the citizen shaping the fortune of the State,—this is

the history of Germania, the legitimate fruit of her teachings. "Nec regibus infinita aut libera potestas" is not less descriptive of the royal power of Europe at the present time, than when it was recorded of the old Teutonic kings by Tacitus.

But the second form under which Germania exists in Modern History, has deviated less from the tendencies of its principles, and the English Constitution is the perfect fruit of the German *spirit*. Here the invasion of the Saxons and Danes was not an infiltration of a foreign element into an established society. It was rather a change of *position* than *condition*, that the Germans experienced, and German customs developed into the English government almost exclusive of every other element. To restrain the spirit of independence from running into its anarchical extreme, it was necessary here, as on the Continent, that the Roman system should exert its influence. The Hepharchy had indeed been changed into a single kingdom by the superior skill and prudence of Egbert, but it required the strong central government introduced by the Norman conquest to destroy forever the power of those mighty chiefs, and thus render England a united people. But as if to preserve the Germanic character unmixed, Roman institutions were brought to bear externally and through a people whose origin and early history were the same as those of the Anglo-Saxons. The Norman conquest introduced into England that system which had already resulted from the union of the Roman law with German custom; hence, though the revolution was thorough, completely setting aside the old institutions, even adopting a new language, thus separating still further the conquered from the conquerors, there was a sympathy between the two arising out of their common origin, which eventually overcame all opposition, and succeeded in abolishing the foreign spirit when its mission was ended. In the inner life of society German met German, and, in spite of opposing influences, the triumph of this element became inevitable. The English Government, then, in all its relations, is the embodiment of the German spirit. The limited royal power, the representative legislative assembly, the nobles and commons, the common law with that jealous guardian of

civil liberty, trial by jury, all these have their prototypes in the customs of the ancient Saxons.

There is a fact running through English history, which, while a proof of the practical common sense of English mind, marks conclusively the growth of those principles which the barbaric invasion transplanted to this little isle. From the time that William the Conqueror swore with hand on sacred relics, before Bishop Fritrik, to preserve inviolable the laws of his Saxon predecessor, through each successive step, down to the latest extension of privilege by the House of Commons, every innovation and revolution have been undertaken not for the purpose of pulling down, but in order to define and defend rights and privileges as ancient as the nation itself. The citizen in all his relations was governed by the customs of his ancestors; hence the external life of society was determined by its internal condition. As constitutional monarchy is the present result of the *first* form of German development, so constitutional liberty, that liberty founded on justice and right, that right and justice defined by German custom, that custom defended by German valor, is the consequence of the second. The English constitution and "Matre pulchra filia pulchrior," the American Republic, are the true representative policies of the *spirit of Modern History*.

"The liberty of the Germans is more vigorous than the tyranny of the Arsacidæ" is the testimony of the Roman Historian, and the nineteenth century verifies the record of the first. The same power which prepared a grave in the heart of the Teutobergen forests for Varrus and his three legions, humbling the pride of Cæsar, and proclaiming thus far and no further to the triumphant march of the first Rome, pronounced the doom of the second in the victory of the Reformation. Its bright deeds are written in the glory of Morgarten and Waterloo, the Thermopyla and Marathon of our times, and its hand deposited the last remains of the ancient system in the sarcophagus of St. Helena.

The imperishability of Ilium has passed to her successor, and though finding no place among the nations of the earth whose

power, dominion and mighty works shed an all-absorbing splendor around their names, Germania still lives and grows with constantly increasing strength. The finger of the Almighty God traced the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights for mankind in German institutions and German characters, and hand-in-hand with Christianity they have gone forth regenerating the body social and politic. In the uprearing of mighty nationalities, in the growth of all free constitutions, in the transformation of old governments, in the abolition of political systems under whatever form they embodied the *ancient spirit*, in the union of royal power with the rights and prerogatives of the citizen, in the laws which govern the intercourse of nation with nation, as well as those which rule the relations between individuals and between the governed and the governing, in every bulwark of liberty, in the wealth and prosperity consequent to individual freedom, here is the history of Germania written that "he who runs may read." As modern German mind rules the world of intellect and thought, so the universal empire of the political spirit of ancient Germany can claim with more justice now, than when national pride and arrogance dictated,

"Alles Erdreich Ist Oestreich Unterthan."

ART. IV.—DIVINE REVELATION.

BY E. E. HIGBEE, D. D., PROFESSOR IN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
MERCERSBURG, PA.

It is not possible to reach any full apprehension of the Holy Scriptures, except as we take into consideration the mystery of divine revelation, which is not to be regarded as identical with these Scriptures themselves. This course is made necessary by the fact, which all will acknowledge, that the Scriptures must rest upon an antecedent self-utterance of God, in the proper apprehension of which under inspiration they themselves come to have their existence. Without God's manifestation of himself first, how could any one ever feel challenged either to receive or to declare his word? Without an objective self-communication of God in some form to the creature, how could seer or prophet ever be called or qualified either to see or to speak? As in the natural, sensation and perception and conscious thought refer at once to an external, objective world of nature, in the presence of which they come into activity; so in the supernatural, neither faith, nor inspiration, nor religious life even, however native to the constitution of man's being, can have any proper reality without the presence of an objective supernatural world opening itself before man in God's revelation of himself.

We are speaking here, of course, of God's self-revelation to the creature, not of that inner revelation, in which, as personal, God ever knows himself in his own consciousness. This latter is unconditioned, or rather eternally self-conditioned by the very nature of God himself. The former, however, must be conditioned on the one hand by the object which the divine will has in view, and on the other, by the peculiar moral constitution of man to whom the divine manifestation directs it.

self. The revelation of God, as outward merely, confronting the order of our life from quite another and foreign sphere, can be nothing but magical wonderwork or transient theophany, unless the outward manifestation in some way finds lodgment in man,—unless it meets in him some point of contact, where it may be apprehended as an utterance of God. If on the outside entirely of man's moral being, or if breaking in upon this being in such form as to violate or set aside its essential law, the manifestation may be an utterance of God indeed, but no revelation of him to us. It is but a subversion of the very idea of man's being, as involving conscious moral determination, to imagine that God may use it as a passive instrument, and at the same time expect to work out for it or in it, without moral mediation, a knowledge of himself. For man this would be no knowledge whatever, for the process through which by such means it might be supposed to be gained, would stand in direct, irreconcilable antagonism with the essential law of all intellection in his moral constitution. The outward manifestation of God, in this case, would be but mirrored into him and reflected from him, as the sky in the unconscious depths and from the tranquil surface of the passive water. It could have no ethical import for him, and could in no sense be regarded as entering into the order of his life or history. Hence we have said that the revelation of God, as coming immediately from him, is conditioned not only by the object which the divine will has in view, but also by the moral constitution of man to whom it is directed.

The creation indeed is no revelation of God, except as there lies in it the possibility of becoming conscious of him as its creator. Day unto day may utter speech, and night unto night may show knowledge, yet all this must be to the creature as though is were not, if he have no ear in which the swelling voice may be syllabled into consciousness, and no reason in which such show of knowledge may be grasped and permanently held. What would be the whole world of nature, with its wondrous compass of activities, with its vast manifoldness of forms, with its ten thousand utterances from above and from beneath, what

would it all be to the creature, if, without any self-conscious and self-determining personality, he should come in and go out, through birth and death, incapacitated to know either himself or his surroundings, moved by blind instincts from the cradle to the grave through a pathway unseen and unsought, not knowing the whence or the whither of his strange pilgrimage?

Not such, however, is the result of God's creative activity. The order of the finite does not live and move and have its being in God in such a blind and passive way. At its summit, it reaches beyond the purely physical into a moral world, in which it comes to the power of self-knowing and self-determining. In the presence of human thought, in the whole mystery of man's intellectual life, and in the bosom of his self-determining will, the otherwise dark solitude of nature is illumined. Here it awakens into a new life as it comes to a self-realization in man's being, and enters upon a process, not of blind movement in the way of physical organization and development, but of free, moral activity in the way of history, unfolding all the vast organisms which constitute the ethical life of the race. But even beyond this, the whole order of creation in man comes to stand face to face with God. Man is created after God's image; and as he is conscious of himself and of the world, in the mutual relations of which thought and will continually realize themselves, so has he a God-consciousness, in the activity of which, as confronted with God's revelation around him and in him through the order of nature and the order of history, his knowledge of self and the world is entered by a knowing of God, which forms, we may say the base-element of his spiritual being, interfusing the life of thought with the life of religion. How can it be conceived as possible, then, that any outward manifestation of God should come to assert its presence in the world by setting aside at the start the moral constitution of that world in man, sinking it back into the sphere of the merely passive out of whose darkness it had already emerged by the creative act of God? In such case the supernatural would be but contranatural, standing in direct an-

tagonism with the whole order of history, never entering it, and therefore proving a failure as regards the only conceivable object of its manifestation.

We are far from maintaining here that God's self-revelation does not originate wholly in a sphere transcending the life of the world. Its source and content are, of course, God himself, and both alike above nature and above reason; yet the divine manifestation is not in such a sense contranatural and contrarational as not to be able to find lodgment through moral mediation in these spheres. Our reason is itself relative and in process, not absolute. Its horizon, its scope of vision, is limited, ever widening as reason develops itself in its own exercise. A manifestation of God may therefore be above reason in its relativity as possessed by man while it is not and cannot be without self-contradiction in opposition to reason viewed as absolute. The orb of nature also is not so hedged in by creative act as to have no point of possible contact for the supernatural, no point of entrance, as it moves on in its relative process towards the realization of its own divine idea, for God's self-manifestation not only to but also in its very order of life.

While thus admitting the reality of God-consciousness as a characteristic element of man's being, which may be, and indeed is, met by a supernatural world in the bosom of which alone it can find its true exercise and proper completeness, it must not be supposed for a moment that this peculiar consciousness can of itself construct the supernatural, or come to any proper development without its presence. As in the lower sphere of our life there are capacities which by the very organism of our physical being are turned toward an eternal world, but which, without the presence of such world, can come to no exercise or development, as, for example, the eye for light, the ear for sound, so the human spirit in its own nature looks out toward the supernatural, but its capacity in this direction must be met before it can come to have proper contents or activity—just as the eye must be met by light before vision has any reality. The eye makes not the light, but only comes to see in the light. The God-consciousness makes not the illumining divine manifesta-

tion, but forms that point where this manifestation may come to assert its presence and reality, and thus find lodgment in the bosom of our life. We may say then that God's self-manifestation looks to that capacity of man's spirit in which it may find the possibility of being received and of thus becoming morally effective. It breaks in upon the world from its own height of glory, not to overthrow or overwhelm the order of nature and history, but to exalt and perfect the same, as man by communion therewith comes to apprehend its mystery, its moral meaning, and its content of life. It comes neither as a magic theophany from without, nor as an ideal myth rising up into fancied actualness from within out of the depths of human aspirations, but as a real, though supernatural fact, entering and authenticating itself in history, linking itself on to its onward flow, and unfolding its content to the unfolding receptivity and apprehension of the human spirit.

It is necessary here, however, before we can fully bring into view the moral aim of God's self-manifestation as conditioned by the ethical constitution of man, to speak of the fall, in and by which man's whole being has been deranged and darkened. The moral process, which lay before the finite will as a created power of self-determination and therefore of course not at the outset already determined by God, would have been met, we may suppose, if the human will had determined the divine as the centre and law of its life, by a more rapid and full unfolding of God's self-communication. There would have been then no self-constructed barrier against the same, no self-defacement of the soul by which the truth and wholeness of the divine manifestation could be broken up, disintegrated, distorted, and in the end lost. The human spirit, like the Eden around it, would then have been open for the incoming supernatural light and glory. The Logos, as the infinite source of light to the whole creation, would not have shined through a suppressing darkness, as coming into the world. But man's fall through transgression so covered the whole compass of his being and history as to require not only a special revelation of God, but also such a purification of man's spiritual capacities as to ena-

ble him to recognize the divine presence itself amidst his own darkness and that of the world. God's manifestation, therefore, while having in view ultimately a full self-communication to the creature, so directed itself in the way of redemption as to awaken and develop and purify man's capacity to receive the unfolding mystery. It enclosed within itself this important moral aim, and hence we find it adapting itself to the conditions of human life and history, and reaching out in real progress through a twofold process, as on the one hand God addresses himself to man, and as on the other, man's susceptibility for the divine is challenged, aroused, strengthened, and purified. In other words the God-consciousness, as by sin disturbed, disorganized, and darkened, must be enlightened and purified. Having no power to elevate itself out of the fallen condition of human life, it has at the same time also no power to meet with undistorted vision the supernatural mystery which in God's manifestation is made to confront it. Divine revelation, therefore, as it progressively unfolds itself, keeps steadily in view, since it cannot truly reach man except through moral mediation, this object, that it may through man's capacity awakened and energized by it, become apprehended and felt.

From this it is evident that the revelation in order to become in any proper moral sense a reality in human life or history, must consist not only in an *outward manifestation* confronting man from the supernatural world, but also and at the same time in an *inward inspiration* through which the outward manifestation may come to a full and true authentication of itself in human apprehension. These two factors are absolutely essential to constitute the reality of a divine revelation. What would the outward manifestation be if alone, and beyond any true human apprehension, but a dazzling, bewildering theophany; a magic display of unintelligible wonders, with no moral meaning, and having no possible lodgment in history; a transient meteor flashing through the darkness and nothing more? And again, in what would the weak efforts of man's sin-disturbed God-consciousness, if not confronted with its true and proper content from the spiritual world and at the same time if

not, in connection with this, divinely illumined, in what would they result, but in fastastic dreamy myths, mistaking and perverting the whole reality of the divine? It is just this that we behold in heathenism, where these two necessary factors of divine revelation are wanting. Here the human spirit, moved by the religious impulse essential to it, and unable under sin to realize the measure of divine manifestation confronting it in nature and history, constructs an unreal supernatural world which is related to the order of history only magically, having no proper moral meaning or effect. The whole movement swings between the formation of myths and their dissolution by philosophy, while the sense of dissatisfaction is only deepened as the spirit sinks back into a helpless cry for deliverance and light. In Judaism, however, we find quite the opposite of all this. Here the whole revelation is moral and not magical from beginning to end. It enters really into the movement of history, embodies itself in institutions and forms of law, and unfolds its power in a real historical way from age to age.

These two factors of divine revelation, to which we have referred, viz., the *outward manifestation*, and *inward inspiration*, although both alike supernatural, yet so connect themselves with the order of our life in the bosom of nature as to become themselves historical. The divine manifestation progresses, unfolding itself step by step towards its consummation. It gives us no arbitrary, random play of supernatural forces, now brilliant and dazzling, and now dim and shadowy, and always magical and outside of the orbit of history. The progress is such that each succeeding manifestation is linked with what has gone before as a fuller unfolding of its meaning, widening thus the horizon of man's God-consciousness, challenging a profounder exercise of his capacities God-ward, and pouring into the surrounding darkness a larger measure of light in which the whole process more clearly reveals itself as prophetic of the sublime issue toward which it is moving. This process, although at every point divinely ordered, has not its orbit separate and beyond the sphere of our life. It so interpenetrates this latter as to adapt itself to the whole progressive development of humani-

ty, unfolding to the stimulated apprehension thereof more and more of its content, meeting its awakened wants and susceptibilities, and thus continually lodging itself in the very bosom of the world's history. It is just this, as we have already intimated, which characterizes Judaism, the special sphere of such manifestations, as over against Heathenism, where everything supernatural assumes a visionary, fantastic, mythical character, without moral content, and hence without any positive moral discipline.

When the outward manifestation takes the form of what may be called a fact of nature, it so transcends what nature itself can exhibit as to challenge at once marked attention, and at the same time hedges the mind in to an acknowledgment of its inexplicable character upon the base of nature merely, so that if there be present in the one addressed by such fact any susceptibility for the supernatural, this may be aroused and excited into activity toward an appreciation and solution of the mystery. And again, the mysterious nature-fact in which God comes to manifest his presence stands not alone, but connects itself with whatever of manifestation has preceded it, and also with what is to follow, and moreover encloses a moral significance in relation to the end which it has in view as well as to the historical condition of the person or persons addressed by it: and all this becomes in the end a bosom of illumination in which the apprehension of the mystery finds itself corroborated and firmly certified. Thus it is also that the manifestation, although confined to the physical, comes to articulate to man's apprehension not merely God's presence in the way of supernatural power, but in some measure, according to the aim of the special manifestation itself, it declares his will, that is, what he is and what he means by such presence. The fact is not a mere wonderwork, but one which has moral significance, a teleological fact, a miracle replete with ethical content.

In the interest of skepticism it has been held that the physical world is one in which there is a sublime presence of law, which makes it of necessity an unchangeable order, so that any nature-fact not of such order must be such a transcendence of

the same as either to be denied because bringing the divine author of the physical and the supposed divine author of the miracle into direct antagonism, or to be explained away upon merely natural grounds. The very point which we have in consideration is by this view entirely neglected, viz., that already the order of nature as in the divine mind has been violated by the presence of sin in the sphere of human life, and that now, in view of the fact that man's entire capacity of knowing God is darkened, the revelation of nature after its own order is inadequate to give a clear articulation of the divine amidst such moral darkness, and must in the interest of redemption be so strengthened by the entrance of a mystery into its own sphere which shall, just by its transcendence of nature, bring into the sphere of man's possible vision, as divinely illumined, what shall necessitate an acknowledgment of the idea of God to solve its mystery and grasp its meaning. The very objection of skepticism is here but an evidence of the necessity of the special manifestation, showing as it does how prone the human consciousness is to rest in the merely natural without any proper acknowledgment of the possible presence of the supernatural in it.

It is evident, however, that God's self-manifestation can come to no adequate completion in the sphere of the physical alone. In the order of nature itself, the creative process does not consummate itself in the physical, but reaches beyond into the moral, the sphere of history, which rests however upon the physical as its necessary base. So in the process of divine manifestation, the physical sphere only forms the base for the higher and historical, where the will of God, where indeed the whole compass of his moral attributes, may find utterance. We must have, therefore, if the idea of God is to find any full lodgment in our consciousness, not only supernatural facts in the sphere of the physical, but also supernatural *historical* facts, in which the divine manifestation may show itself. Both are inseparably connected, and continually penetrate each other, so that in the very order of our life we have another and supernatural order authenticating its presence, we have a history

within history. God, in his redemptive process of self-manifestation to man who is unable in his sinful condition to give to his capacity Godward any proper or sure content gathered from the data of history in the sphere only of this world, brings into history, as into nature, supernatural historical facts which not only challenge his profoundest attention, but excite him to a solution of their mystery and meaning, and which as before, transcending the natural order, hedge him in to an acknowledgment of the divine presence therein and also to a certain conviction of God's special moral attributes which there come to utterance. Here again we have a process in which the various parts are in organic relation and which holds within itself the idea which the whole movement is to realize; and this idea, as controlling it from beginning to end, is in the process brought before the awakened apprehension of mankind with ever-increasing clearness. In relation to this idea, which, as we shall hereafter see, is the Incarnation of the Word, the facts are at once historical and at the same time vast prophetic types and pregnant symbols, which when viewed in the light of the completed manifestation are seen to belong to that great mystery, which as coming into the world opened its own pathway through that world's darkness with such streams of dawning light.

So also as regards the other factor of divine revelation, *viz.*, *inspiration*, there is nothing magical or arbitrary. There is and must be here also a moral mediation. The essential law of human apprehension cannot be mechanically set aside or overthrown, and man's spirit become a mere instrument wrought upon by an external force which in no way truly enters the moral constitution which it is to effect. From what has already been said in reference to the moral aim of the outward manifestation this must be apparent. The general subjective base of inspiration is man's God-consciousness, his capacity Godward. This is, of course, affected by sin which covers the whole sphere of man's knowing. Confronting this higher power of knowing, as darkened by sin, the outward manifestation comes, arousing it into activity, and directing its concentrated attention upon the mystery which it presents. This,

however, is not of itself enough. In immediate connection with the outward manifestation there must be also a supernatural inward illumination, for the reception of which the aroused capacity is prepared, and in which the apprehension as held to the definite manifestation confronting it, becomes assured of its own wholeness and certain truth. The illumination, although in every sense supernatural, yet enters within the human spirit, and through the enlightened and enlivened activities of the same as directed to the manifestation, accomplishes a true and supernaturally evidenced apprehension therein.

There are of course different forms of inward illumination; yet all are of such a character as to find a real base of connection in the peculiar moral organism of the individual, and are not magical, nor unconditioned by the outward manifestation which serves at the same time as stimulant, and limit, and attestation. No psychological system can well neglect those mysterious soul-instincts which in forms of dreams and visions and presentiments assert their presence amidst the surrounding physical and moral world. Although passive and not properly within the sphere of active, conscious thought, yet when met by their proper counterpart in actual facts, they take in conjunction with these in the consciousness the form of solemn attestations. In other words, there is a sense of mutual recognition, as it were, in which the vision and facts are seen at once to flow together as from the self-same source beyond the ordinary sphere of the soul's activity. Here there is found, we think, a natural psychological point of connection for that supernatural illumination which assumes the form of dream and vision, but which is always limited and controlled within the outward manifestation which must serve continually to evidence the reality and truthfulness of the resultant revelation. At least we can feel that an apprehension of this kind, effected in such form by supernatural illumination, does not violate the essential structure of our psychical nature.

But beyond these lower forms of inward illumination, there are in the human spirit certain powers, which, under an

aroused activity, under the breathings of some mysterious presence, bring into the consciousness a wondrous light,—a rapid combination of its elements of thought, felt not to have been self-originated. A new comprehensive truth flashes upon the view, filling the soul with illumination in which the temporal becomes almost translucent with the eternal, in which there is, what Coleridge calls, an “etherial intuition,” “a flash of revealing light,” “a glorious birth of the God-like within us.” This natural inspiration, which makes genius itself a prophet of nature,—a sibyl, revealing mysteries which flood the soul with enlivening recognitions of its own strength and glory and destiny, whose voice “wins not by words of rhetoric”—

“Lip-blossoms breathing perishable sweets;
But by the power of the informing Word
Roll sounding onward through a thousand years
Her deep prophetic bodements,”

this, “the vision and the faculty divine,” what is it, but a pre-figuration, so to speak,—a semblance and seeking,—an *analogon* of that higher, supernatural, prophetic illumination which here finds a point of connection, but which in full union with the outward divine self-manifestation, carries what otherwise might be viewed as only the creation of imagination into the sphere of certain historical reality. This *prophetic inspiration*, finding a point of entrance in man without making him a mere passive instrument, and energizing to the highest degree the whole capacity of thought and intuition within him, is itself however confined to the outward divine manifestation, and is on every side conditioned by it. The manifestation being progressive, the inspiration is also. While of course infallible in its sphere, it is yet relative and not absolute. It cannot transcend the outward manifestation to which it is linked, and only when the manifestation reaches its consummation with the accompanying inspiration, can we speak of an absolute revelation of God. This is reached in Christ, where there is the full self-manifestation of God, and at the same time the very fulness of the indwelling Spirit. Here God is fully declared (*εξαγεσθω*), and the God-consciousness of the human carried to

its very highest potency in his person. God spake in the prophets in fragments ($\piολυμερως$), and with manifoldness of application ($\piολυτροτως$), to each successive age, but in these last days spake in a *Son, absolutely*, for he was the brightness of his glory and the express image of his person. (Hebrews i. 1-2.)

In saying that God's self-manifestation is progressive, and that while unfolding itself, the capacity to receive it upon the part of man is thereby strengthened, purified, and enlarged, we have of course assumed that the whole movement has within itself a certain aim. This aim can be none other than that of history also, which is itself revelation as the unfolding of the divine purpose in the forms of human thought and will. It were strange indeed that the creation in its formation should manifest a wondrous order and symmetry, and yet that in its movement toward its own proper fulness, under the divine love, it should become a mere play of random forces with no meaning, and of course with no possibly intelligible issue. We are necessitated to assume, in view of the acknowledgment of God, that the creation has meaning in its process, as having its ground of being and continuance in Him. It has some issue towards which it looks. But here, as before, we cannot conceive that man is to be driven on unconsciously toward such issue, as though it were something not to be wrought out within the sphere of his life. He cannot be forced on toward the end, whatever that may be, by blind fate or blind instincts. If so, then the world to reach its proper completion must sink down into the merely mechanical, or physical or instinctive from the sublime height of reason and will in which its creation was crowned by Jehovah. Such a completion would be like that of a plant blossoming into a stone. Such a completion of the world-process would be its incompleteness, would be but an acknowledgment of its failure after all, and man's redemption would be made only the evisceration of the very content of his moral being. The moral aim, for such there must be, of divine revelation as constituted by the two factors, outward manifestation and inward inspiration, and as itself in the sphere of his-

tory, is both to bring home clearly and surely to man's consciousness the idea of God, and with this the divine will and purpose in the whole order of history, in the bosom of which he has his being, and also at the same time so to release him from the law of sin and death, and so to quicken him as that the entire possibilities of his being, as in the divine mind, may reach out to complete realization.

Such divine purpose can only be grasped by us as it unfolds itself and comes to its completion; yet to answer the ends of a positive and conscious process in such direction, which is necessary to a moral nature, there must be a continuous assertion of the presence and general scope of the divine purpose, in which the reason and will and faith of mankind may find themselves challenged to see and act and adore. We may therefore, and indeed must, expect that at the very outset, divine revelation will hold out before man the great process and issue in and toward which his life is called freely to direct itself,—that it will confront him with a divine utterance which shall serve to challenge his faith, illumine his darkness, condition his activity, and at the same time, while meeting his wants and supplying strength to his weakness, keep firmly and steadily before him what he must acknowledge as the profound overture whose full compass of meaning will only be grasped when it reaches its completion in that great work of which to him it is itself the introduction.

This which seems so necessary, is just what meets us at the opening of the Old Testament, as the historical record of the divine revelation, accomplished, as we have said, in history by supernatural divine outward manifestation, and by supernatural inward human inspiration. In this historical record, as well as in living institutions of history and in the individual moral nature, the revelation took permanent form from age to age, and was held before the consciousness in its various steps, and continued within the scope of man's vision, so that each manifestation as succeeding the other might open up to the apprehension that content which man's susceptibility had not as yet found itself adequate to grasp.

Here then, in this historical record, at the very base of history, we have man presented before us, made in the image of God, with the natural and supernatural worlds surrounding him, and beginning the unfolding of all his powers with the divine will uttering itself as that which he should freely determine to be the law of life. In view of the mystery of sin already an accomplished fact in the world of angelic intelligence, the will of God, as that which should govern the human will in the moral process before it, but govern it as we have said through its own free determination, uttered itself in a negative command in which man was warned against the threatening temptation and the terrible issue. Notwithstanding this, the possibility of the fall became an actual fact, and now the divine revelation, as redemptive, sets before man as fully adapted to the circumstances inward and outward in which his history commences, that profound mystery of conflict between death and life in which the seed of the woman shall gain victory by bruising the serpent's head. This is the grand overture, the sublime *protevangelion*, of which we have spoken, wherein God discovers himself and his will, and challenges the attention of man, drawing him toward it by his very needs, inspiring and strengthening his hopes, ever breaking in upon his surrounding darkness, awakening his faith, stimulating his susceptibility God-ward to penetrate and hold the hallowed mystery, and poisoning his whole life, while apprehending it so far as possible, toward the grand consummation which it continually holds out before him as that which is to be wrought out in the sphere of his history.

Although we have in this first promise centuries of history condensed, so that the beginning and end are held together as in a vast germ; yet the process reaching from the one to the other is gradual and historical, not however in the sense that the world develops from out of itself any such issue. Rather the supernatural mystery of divine manifestation, as opening the way for its consummation in the order of our life, is historical as it continually recapitulates under itself the whole movement of history, taking up, as apprehended, a true lodgment in the

world, and becoming thus the supernatural underlying motive of every process which is positively directed toward the end which it has in view. The process is gradual just because the divine manifestation as we have said, is not magical, but comes into nature and history, conditioning itself always in relation to its possible apprehension upon the part of man. Of necessity the horizon of man's consciousness, and the sphere of his knowing are limited. He is, body, and soul and spirit, within the finite. The limit is not a *fixed* limit, however, as though at the start there could be no enlargement of capacity and no widening of the sphere of knowing. His every power has its possible process of increase. He is by his very nature in the order of history. His God-consciousness is no exception. Under the presence of the supernatural world, and in the onward progress of history it can be developed, and the divine manifestation serves continually not only to arouse it into activity, but also to give to it more and more content. But it must do this without violating the essential law of the development of moral life. If bursting in upon the world at once with its infinity of glory man would be but overwhelmed. The finite would be swallowed up. The mystery not being grasped at all would be no illumination of man's darkness, but rather a blinding of his whole capacity of vision through such magical excess of light. Hence the divine revelation has its own movement, in which the divine manifestation brings more and more of God into view, and in which the inspiration is all the while bound to this progressive unfolding as the ever widening and certain sphere of its vision.

This movement, as already intimated, must from the very nature of the case be twofold. The divine manifestation, having its source in God's purpose of love to communicate himself to the creature, reaching out to its fulness; and the inspiration resting upon the great truth that man has a capacity which is at the same time being developed, to receive within the bosom of his being such consummation. Just this is what meets us in the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament. Upon the base of the first promise, the record represents a series of divine mani-

festations which as mutually interdependent follow each other, and which in promise and admonition, in covenant and law, in visions and prophecy, in institutions and record, bring nearer and nearer the fulness of God's redemptive condescension, and all this in full adaptation to the historical condition and needs of each succeeding age. At the same time and by means of this there is an inward moral process which forms the bosom in which the manifestation is continually operative, and which reaches out to the height of human susceptibility in the sphere of the finite: and this whole sublime movement is in the midst of the darkness and confusion and conflicts of a world in sin. The end of this *preparatory* unfolding of divine manifestation meets us in that ineffable mystery where the Angel of the Lord confronts the Virgin Mary, and announces to her susceptible heart the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost. So also we have here the human susceptibility completed in its preparatory fitness, in the precious response of her who had found favor with God, "behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it unto me according to thy word." Here the old process ceases, and the divine manifestation, and the divine inspiration find their absolute fulness in their glorious and entire oneness in the person of the incarnate Christ. His whole life is divine manifestation in every act, and divine inspiration in every knowing, forever completed and forever one.

We have said nothing thus far of the development of heathenism, as this is outside of the sphere of special divine revelation. Yet, from what has been said, it can be seen that even here the revelation itself did not arbitrarily cast off from the benefit of its discipline a portion of the world. At first it confronted the whole race as included in Adam, and only as its mystery was on the one hand felt and acknowledged, or on the other, disregarded, was there a division in humanity. Of course, the progressive divine manifestation unfolded itself in immediate connection with its possibility of being understood; and hence there came to be in the divergent attitudes of mankind in reference to it a gradual separation into two great processes of history, one, where as apprehended the divine revela-

tion took up into itself the course of development, another, where not apprehended and acted upon, human life went on unfolding itself on the base simply of the natural, having no other data of divine manifestation than that which met its capacity Godward in the order of nature and history. These divergent processes in their incipiency meet us at the outset in Abel in contrast with Cain, in Seth, Enoch and others in whom the divine revelation authenticated itself, as over against the men of the world by whom its mystery was neither apprehended nor regarded. We find an acknowledgment of this truth in the profound statement of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where Abel and Enoch and Noah are held up as acting in the sphere of faith, in the sphere of an awakened susceptibility for the divine manifestation which was challenging the world. In this way most naturally and historically did the promise develop itself into covenant in which by supernatural guidance a chosen seed came to hold within its special history the progressive unfolding of the mystery. It would have been but magical and abrupt had the divine manifestations not linked themselves together in their series where each succeeding one was made to hold itself in connection with what had gone before. How could the manifestations, if of such character come to find any proper lodgment, if passing out of their own past history, they should be made to confront the heathen world? This heathen world, however, as part of the grand process of history, cannot be said to have had no relation whatever to the reality of divine revelation. There can be recognized among the heathen continually a deeper and more wide-felt consciousness asserting itself, that the religious nature essential to man and therefore possessed by themselves, needs and must have a clearer enunciation of the idea of God and his will than in their mythologies and theosophies, to solve the terrible enigma of their sin-darkened development; and hence the consummation of the divine manifestation came to stand before them as that which they might regard as the heavenly response to their blind gropings and questionings after God.

Divine revelation in its absolute character, as we have re-

marked, is found in the person of Christ. He is divine manifestation and divine inspiration in their entire completeness and unity. He is the acme of the whole process of divine revelation; and therefore, the entire fragmentary manifestation before him had ever its objective ground in him, its controlling type and plasticity.* He confronts the world, directing all to himself, as holding in his own person the whole orb of divine light, and the exhaustless fountain of true spiritual life. To this one central sun of the whole supernatural world mankind is to look. Of this one perennial spring mankind is to drink, whose waters become in it a well springing up to everlasting life. All inspiration now must direct itself to Christ's absolute-ness of manifestation, and in him the world must come to know God's whole revelation of himself to mankind. The whole pathway of history, the whole sphere of past, present and future, the whole economy of the creation from beginning to end must be viewed under this direct illumination. In the ineffable glory of the Only Begotten, the whole march of ages from the closed gates of Eden to the lifting up of the everlasting doors of Heaven, is seen unfolding its mystery of meaning. The morning glimmer of the first promise here comes widening into the golden glow of day. So to the eagle-eye of the beloved John, did the whole pre-Christian past, in the mystery of the Incarnation, reveal itself, as shown by the sublime proem of his Gospel. The Word, eternally God, and eternally with God, bringing the world into being out of the infinity of his power and life, the "pleroma of eternal ideas, of plenipotent energies," himself the life and the light, which as coming into the world

*"Der objective Grund jedes Lebens aber liegt in der Idee, welche in ihm entfaltet, und kürzeren Umstände und Verhältnisse nur als Mittel gebraucht, um ihren innern Reichtum zur Erscheinung zu bringen; auf die biblische Religion übergetragen, in dem göttlichen Geiste, der in stufenweise fortschreitenden Offenbarung die ihm inwohnende Fülle erschließt, bis im gottmenschlichen Leben des Erlösers der göttliche Rathschluss zur vollendeten Verwirklichung kommt. Und da bei allem Lebendigen die Akme der Entwicklung der Typus ist, welcher den Entwicklungsgang selbst von Anfang an bestimmt und beherrscht, so ist dieser Geist der Offenbarung, das objective Prinzip des Alten Bundes, kein anderer als der Geist Christi. Oehler, Proleg. zur Theol. d. Alt. Test. 79, 80.)

lighteth every man, himself opening up the pathway for his full manifestation by bringing the light into the darkness (Heathenism) which struggling could neither suppress nor comprehend it, giving to his own (Judaism), to as many as received him, power to become sons of God, heralded by a long line of preparatory prophets ending in John the Baptist, but at last becoming flesh and dwelling among men, so that they beheld his glory, the glory as of the Only Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.

As thus all antecedent preparatory revelation was but the opening of the way by the Word for his incarnation, a sublime process sweeping over ages, so we have again in this absolute revelation a progress in which the life of Christ as continuous divine manifestation unfolds itself before men, and challenges their susceptibility for the supernatural at every step. In him at every point the inspiration is wholly commensurate with the manifestation. The two are inseparable as they interpenetrate each other in his person. But in his disciples and apostles there is nothing of this absolute character. They see in part and know in part. They are confronted with the mystery, and only gradually rise to an apprehension of it, and this in immediate connection with the whole economy of revelation which had gone before in the Old Testament and in the witnessing of John the Baptist. In their awakened susceptibility they are at first drawn toward him and timidly inquire. "Rabbi, where dwellest thou." Met with the answer "come and see," they tarry with him, and then we next see them hurrying to their most intimate associates with something more than *Rabbi* in their consciousness. We have found the Messias is their language, showing that the revelation of the Old Testament was now beginning to take definite shape in their thought, arousing into more intense activity their efforts to apprehend its meaning in the fulfillment which was now confronting them. So continually as their susceptibility is awakened, Christ directs them to himself as the fulness of life and light, and they in his presence, and by his words and works, are drawn more and more into the bosom of his revelation; but only as the whole manifestation,

which was to be the content to which their inspiration should direct itself, became complete when Jesus conquering death and hell rose and ascended to the right hand of the Father, was the way opened for that full inward illumination, which in the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles brought home to their prepared consciousness the mystery of Christ's presence and words and acts, so that the divine manifestation which they had witnessed in his whole life now came out with its fulness and certainty of revelation. Their own commission, the holy mysteries connected with it, the whole order in fine of the New Testament Church as this had evolved itself from Christ's person and work, now stood with unmistakable clearness before them, and they were ready to enter upon that labor of their office, (itself the fruit of the ascension), in which the manifestation which had confronted them and had lodged itself in the bosom of our life and history through the Holy Ghost was to hold itself before the vision of mankind, challenging their obedience and accomplishing its regenerating and sanctifying work until it should reach out historically in the end to what was lodged in it from the beginning, viz., to the second advent and the new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.

From the very fact that their inspiration was directed continually to the mystery of Christ, which had challenged them as it passed before them and which had drawn them to itself and connected them with the whole constitution of divine grace which it brought into the world, did they at once herald the glorious Gospel, and baptize in Christ's name, challenging obedience to just the positive contents which his person and work had brought into the vision of their faith (creed); and when in this work they were impelled to give a historical record, that record commences of necessity with the life of Christ, and closes with the prophetic unfolding of the content of that life through the spirit in the struggles of the church as moving through the crisis of ages it at last opens before the awed vision of the Seer the last judgment, and kindles the admiring rapture of his love with the New Jerusalem prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.

ART. IV.—DORNER'S HISTORY OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY.*

BY J. W. NEVIN, D.D.

This interesting and important volume makes its appearance as one of a series of works devoted to the History of the Sciences generally in Modern Germany; a noble undertaking, which is carried forward it appears, by the special patronage of the King of Bavaria, and under the auspices of a commission acting in behalf of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Munich. Upwards of twenty different works are embraced in the plan; several of which have been already completed, while the rest are in active preparation; all from eminent scholars, supposed to be properly fitted for their task. There is a History of modern Catholic Theology in the series, a History of Philosophy, a History of Aesthetics, a History of Classical Philology, a History of Geology, a History of Medicine, and so on through the catalogue of the more important Sciences generally. Dorner's History of Protestant Theology forms the fifth volume of the course.

It is not necessary to say, that it is a work of the first merit in its own order. How could it be otherwise, coming from such a theologian as Dorner, and occupied with so fruitful a theme as the movement of Protestant Theology from the age of Luther down to the present time?

The very idea of a *History of Protestant Theology*, as we have it here brought into view, is eminently suggestive and full of instruction. It implies at once, the author tells us, the con-

* Geschichte der Protestantischen Theologie, besonders in Deutschland, nach ihrer principiellen Bewegung und im Zusammenhang mit dem religiösen, sittlichen und intellectuellen Leben betrachtet von DR. J. A. DORNER. Auf Veranlassung und mit Unterstützung Seiner Majestät des Königs von Bayern, Maximilian II. Herausgegeben durch die historische Commission bei der Königl. Academie der Wissenschaften. München, 1867.

ception of an organized unity and wholeness in this theology, in distinction from all merely outward aggregation of opinions; since in no other view could it be said to have any living history whatever. To be historical, moreover, it must be more than it is taken to be where it is regarded as a protest simply against previously existing errors, the negation and contradiction of the theology of the Roman Catholic Church; it must have a positive substance and independent existence of its own, aside from all that may belong to it as accidental only in its relations to other systems. It must enter in this view integrally into the general constitution of Christianity, and show itself to be a necessary part of its proper universal life. Only so can it have a right to exist, or be a subject at all for scientific study.

Thus positive and historical in its own nature, Protestantism must be also the product and outbirth of what Christianity was before it made its appearance. It is impossible to conceive of it as being historical at all, except as Christianity at large is seen and acknowledged to be historical. There is a view of Protestantism, we know, which owns no necessity for this; which sees in it rather wrong and disparagement to the whole cause of religion in the Protestant form. Its assumption is, that what is called the history of the Church in previous centuries was no history of Christianity at all, in any proper sense of the term; that Christianity for ages before had not been historical, but existed only in the Bible, or as the dim memory of a long buried past; that the history of the Church had become the movement and record only of a vast system of corruptions, which had well nigh extinguished at last the light and power of the Gospel altogether. How could Protestantism be supposed to derive its existence in any positive way from so foul a womb? How could its sweet waters flow from a fountain so full of impurity and bitterness? To be of God, in these circumstances, it must be a new religion entirely, drawn fresh from the Bible, having no connection with the life of the Catholic Church as it stood before, except in the way of protest and denial, and related to what Christianity may be imagined to have been in the beginning, only as its abrupt reproduction and restoration with-

out any regard to intervening time. This view of the origin and meaning of Protestantism was once common, and there are certain quarters in which it is entertained still. But it is too late in the day, to allow it now any sort of consideration. For science and religion alike, it may be considered as fairly and forever exploded. They are bad Protestants, everywhere and always, who insist on making Protestantism unhistorical. The life of the world universally is historical, a moving stream of united, continuous existence. It is so especially in Christianity, which is the central current of this stream. And if Protestantism be in fact, as it claims to be, the inmost and deepest sense of Christianity, then is it plain, not only that it must have a history of its own from the time of its appearance in the sixteenth century, but also that this history must so issue forth from the general historical flow of what Christianity was all along before, as to be plainly its continuation, and at the same time the deepest power of it, reaching onward now in such new form to its ultimate destination. Only in such view can it deserve confidence, or be entitled to any rational consideration and respect.

According to Dr. Dorner, this historical relation of Protestantism to Catholicism does not necessarily imply even a full antiquation of the second in favor of the first, authorizing us to say that the older form of Christianity, having served its purpose, has lost its right to exist in giving birth to the new; as Judaism, for example, was abolished by the accomplishment of its own promises through the Gospel. Protestantism, he tells us, may be allowed to be a higher plane of the Christian life than was reached before either by the Greek or Roman Churches—a plane, therefore, to whose level in the end all Christendom must be raised; while yet it may be true, nevertheless, that Protestantism is only itself, for the time, a partial and more or less defective representation of what belongs properly to this loftier stage of Christian history, needing to be complemented by still other forms of evangelical life; which it may not be able then, itself to produce, but must be content to accept in the end from the bosom of the older systems which it

seemed to have left behind. In other words, it is by no means certain that Protestantism, in breaking forth from the womb of the Catholic Church, carried away with it *all* the significance of that Church for the final purposes of Christianity. It could hardly fail, in the circumstances, to be more than the strongly intoned utterance of some one necessary and fundamental view of Christianity, which was felt to be in danger of being overwhelmed by the force which was carrying the Church at large in the opposite direction. Such affirmation became necessarily thus negation, and taking upon itself in this way the form of a standing *protest* against the errors of the Roman Church, made it extremely difficult for the movement to escape afterwards a one-sided character in its own direction, or to admit any free development even of its own life, where this seemed to involve a recognition again of principles and peculiarities belonging to the old religion. Under such view, it is easy to see, that there may be still essential elements of the full and last sense of Christianity, which Protestantism has not yet taken up into its separate life, peculiarities needed to complete the full idea of the Church still slumbering as possibilities in the bosom of the Greek and Roman Communions, which only the elevation of these Communions themselves to the general plane of Protestantism can serve to make the common property of the Christian world in the end. This need not imply then, of course, the breaking up of the old religions in favor of the new. Advanced to the same evangelical stage, all will stand together in free harmony and love, as integral components of one and the same Holy Catholic Christianity.

"Protestantism," says Dr. Dorner, "seeks its ultimate ground in the essence of Christianity, as we have this exhibited to us originally in the Holy Scriptures. But it may not, for all this, decline the task of vindicating its separate existence and peculiar constitution *historically*; that is, the task of showing under a historical view, that there was need for it when it came both negatively and positively, that it came in the fulness of time, and that it is still an indispensable necessity for the Christian world."

The History of Protestant Theology, under the broad view now stated, is divided by Dorner into three books; the first treating of the Origin or Primitive Period of Protestantism; the second, of the Separation of its two Confessions and the Dissolution of the Unity of its original twofold Principle, from the first part of the seventeenth century to the beginning of the nineteenth century; the third, of the Regeneration of Evangelical Theology, as it is supposed to be going forward in our own time. What an interesting field is here offered to the contemplation of the thoughtful student, must be at once evident to all who are in any way prepared to understand the nature of the general subject, or who can at all appreciate the bearings of this subject on the cause of Christianity as a whole.

The First Book (*Die Urzeit des Protestantismus*) opens with a sketch, brief of course, but comprehensive and clear, of the causes and forces which served to prepare the way for Protestantism, ages before its actual advent, in the life of the Catholic Church as it existed previously. These are found to be of a twofold character, negative and positive.

The *negative* side of the preparation lies, of course, in the errors and corruptions of the Roman Church, which gradually took a form that forced upon it the reactionary crisis of the Reformation, as the only way in which the general cause of Christianity could be rescued from destruction. The Catholic Church of the Middle Ages, we are told by Dorner, had accomplished vast service for the world in its time. Our modern life is under infinite obligations to it, for what it wrought in these times of darkness and wild, untamed rudeness, in favor of social order, political discipline, letters, morals, religion, and human culture generally. It was a great advance in these respects on the one-sided intellectualism of the Oriental or Greek Church. It was set for the pedagogy of the new Western nations. But this of itself served to give it a constitution and tendency, which became in the end an unnatural restraint upon the proper independence of the nations. Outward order and rule were made to stand in the way of inward intelligence and freedom. Thus the Church came to be considered

all in all for the purposes of salvation, in the character of a mere outward hierarchical organization, absorbing into itself all kingly, priestly, and prophetical functions; while the people at large were given over to serve mechanical forms, which became for them, in fact, no better than dumb idols, and left them without any sense whatever of their proper inheritance in the free, boundless wealth of the Gospel. Altogether, in this way, the Papacy grew to be an intolerable tyranny for the souls and minds of men, as well as for their outward lives.

The general ground defect of the Mediæval Church life, according to Dorner, lay in its dualistic nature and character. Not of course in the recognition simply of two modes of being, two factorial forces required to meet everywhere in Christianity, the Divine and the human, the objective and the subjective, the general and the individual, the principle of authority and the principle of freedom; but in the want of power there was to bring these different forms of existence to any real inward unity and harmony; in consequence of which, the relation between them was always more or less oppositional, mechanical, and unfree. Such abstract dualism we have in the general theory of the Church which has just been noticed; all rule and power on one side, and on the other only passive, irresponsible dependence and obedience. So in the sphere of doctrine again, we meet it in the conflict between faith and knowledge, reaching through the whole time of the schoolmen, and ending at last in the formal reduction of faith to the character of a mere blind submission to the outward authority of the Church. The result of this was in the end a general demoralization of the intellectual consciousness of the Christian world, wide-spread skepticism and doubt, and a perilous exposure of spirit on all sides to the worst forms of irreligious error. The theological scheme itself which was thus outwardly imposed upon the Church, partook of the same dualistic character. It was a mixture of Pelagianism and magic, oscillating at different points always between superstition and unbelief. With this corresponded the moral and religious life of the time. It swung between extremes. Rigorous in one direction, it was

completely lax in another. It came to no harmony, no inward reconciliation, within itself. Altogether, the religious impotence and misery of the nominally Christian world had grown to be very great; and all must acknowledge that the necessity and demand for the Reformation, which existed in this crying form, go far of themselves to establish the full historical significance of Protestantism.

Along with this want and need, however, went also the working of active forces in the life of the Church itself, all through the Middle Ages, which carried in them the promise of better things to come, and prepared the way powerfully for what took place at last in the sixteenth century. This *positive* preparation for Protestantism must be taken into account as a necessary argument of its truth. All was not dark before its advent. Its historical legitimacy requires us to see in it, not only an answer to the crying necessities of the time going before, but the fulfilment also of its best powers and endeavors. To be true, Protestantism must be the rich, ripe fruit of Mediæval Catholicism, the natural product of its inmost religious spirit, the solution of its deepest problems, the interpretation of the vast riddle that lay involved everywhere in its struggling life. "Only thus," says Dr. Dorner, with great force, "do we possess ourselves of all that was truly great in the Middle Ages, and become able to apprehend the Evangelical Church in her organic connection with the Ancient Church, and so with the Apostolic Period itself; whereas, had she been a new Church, with no intervening life found joining her to this primitive Christianity, she must at once by such unhistorical position alone have raised the suspicion that she was the work mainly of human self-will, and that as she had come abruptly like a sudden meteor—a frightful portent for the Roman Church, it is true—so probably she would suddenly again disappear, without the inward and enduring power of correction that might turn the portent into an occasion of thankful joy for the Roman Church herself (Heb. xii. 7-12). If the Church of the Reformation was to deserve the title *Evangelical*, to which she lays claim, the pure stream of the Gospel, which since the time

of Christ could never have wholly failed among men, must have found in her a new bed; not to draw off thence onward all that was evangelical in the Catholic Church, but to secure it *for* her also as against her own corruption."

The positive forces, which worked thus historically toward the Reformation in the life of the Middle Ages, are supposed by Dorner to fall mainly under the threefold classification of *Mysticism*, *Biblical Study*, and *Popular Culture*. These factors, however, come not forward simultaneously, nor at once in full harmony. They are a growing movement in themselves; and only by their joint result, at the last, give us the reformatory principle in its true Church-renovating form and force.

The movement starts, of course, in the *Mystic Element*, as lying nearest the heart-life of all religion. Here we find, all through the Mediæval Period, a profound struggle in the depths of the religious spirit, the object of which was to reach direct and full communion with God, and which became in this way a continual conflict with the dualistic conditions of the Church system in which it was outwardly comprehended. It took different forms, first predominantly intellectual, then more ethical, culminating finally in the German mysticism, whose best fruit meets us in such writers as Tauler and Thomas a Kempis. There was great merit and vast meaning in the system; but it was at the same time seriously defective, and needed censure and rectification from a different quarter.

This it was brought to meet, in a measure, from the *Biblical Factor*, the second general preparatory force leading toward the Reformation. The study of the Bible stood in no connection at first with *Mysticism*, but followed for a time its own course separately, in the service of the plainest and most practical Christianity, as among the Waldenses. Gradually it attained to more theological insight and depth, as with Wickliffe, Huss, and their followers. With the progress of time, the Biblical and *Mystical* tendencies came more or less into contact with one another; and the result was a benefit on both sides, the flowing together of forces that by their union alone became properly strong for the end they were designed to reach.

“The Biblical tendency, especially in the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, spreading itself from Southern France and Piedmont, through Switzerland, along the Rhine, into the Netherlands and England, and eastwardly into Bohemia, Poland and Moravia, contributed mightily to establish as a fixed axiom throughout Christendom the principle, that the Church must be content to be measured and tried by the Holy Scriptures. It gave impulse also to the numerous translations of the Scriptures into the vernacular tongues, which fall within the same period. Leading representatives of this tendency, as well as the fruit of it, are to be considered in particular those popular and useful fraternities of the Netherlands, the *Brethren of the Common Life*, which were founded by Gerhard Groot in 1384, and improved subsequently by Florentius Radewins; and which, living together with community of goods, but without the constraint of vows, in spiritual though not monkish society, devoted themselves to mutual edification, especially in the knowledge of the Scriptures; following their trades diligently however at the same time, while they made it their business also to diffuse instruction among the people. They disseminated scriptural religious knowledge even among the higher classes, encouraged science, and showed favor also toward the interest of mysticism. With all this, they kept themselves free from all hostile bearing toward the Church; the old fanatical Beghard and Beguin houses reappearing in them thus, under higher and better form. Nowhere else before the Reformation, do we find the elements of reformatory power brought together in such compass as here.”

To complete the working of the mystical and biblical factors, we have, in the third place, the general gradual progress of European *Culture*, which wrought in various ways towards the emancipation of the popular mind from the bonds of ignorance and error, and carried it forward in the direction required for the coming reformation of Christianity and the Church. The revival of letters, indeed, seemed for a time in certain quarters to be more favorable to infidelity than to the cause of true religion; and the movement itself, in this way, needed historical

enlargement and rectification. In the end, however, it fell in harmoniously with the other forces, imparting to them new depth and compass of meaning, and receiving from them in return wholesome regulation in its own course.

After showing in the general way now stated, how the great religious revolution of the sixteenth century grew forth historically from the previous life of the Church, Dr. Dorner goes on to consider, in the second place, the immediate rise of the Reformation itself, in what he calls the unity of its original principle and growth, reaching from a. 1517 to a. 1525. This falls into two divisions or sections; the first treating of the Lutheran Reformation, the second of its counterpart in Switzerland.

To understand the Lutheran Reformation, it is necessary, first of all, to understand Luther himself. As the great genius of the movement, he was, in one sense, the product and birth of the general historical force which was comprehended in it. So it is, we are often told, with all grand movements in the history of humanity. They create, in a certain sense, their own organs, the representative men by whose agency they are brought to pass. But the individual significance of such men, their personal weight as independent forces in what has taken place, is none the less to be acknowledged for this reason. So Luther stands before us as himself the germ and pattern of the new order of life he served to introduce into the Christian world. We see in him "one of those vast historical figures, in which whole nations recognize their own types, their concentrated selves; in which the soul of a new moral and religious existence takes bodily form." How deeply his spirit entered, in this way, into the German mind in particular, is shown strikingly by the tenacity with which the Lutheran Church has all along clung to his name as her distinctive confessional title. It is the misfortune of Protestantism, we cannot help thinking, that this should have been the case. Luther himself, in the spirit of St. Paul, 1 Cor. i. 12, 13, protested against any such quasi-deification of his person; and many of the best Lutherans have deplored it since. But the name has attached itself, for all this, as an indelible signature to the en-

tire Church, down to the present time; and there is no reason now to suppose that either the Church or its theology can ever be known by any other title than Lutheran, as distinguished from Roman Catholicism on one side, and from the Reformed faith on the other. It is only too evident, moreover, that the name itself goes farther here as a bond of union than any doctrine or Church life it is made to represent; since it is notorious that the so called Lutheran Church has embraced, and still continues to embrace, in its voluminous and capacious bosom, many forms of theological and ecclesiastical life, widely variant from one another, as well as in part, also, broadly opposed to all that Luther ever held or taught himself. The power which holds all together through changing generations and over widely sundered lands, is simply the uplifted standard of his vast and mighty name (*in hoc signo!*), enthroned forever, as it would seem, in the depths of the German heart. What clearer argument could we have of the historical and national significance of his person? We have nothing which fully comes up to it, in this view, anywhere else, either in the history of the Church or in the history of the world.

Luther himself, of course, had no conception of his own character or work, in becoming thus the organ of the German Reformation. There was no forethought or plan in what he did. It is not in that way, ever, that truly representative men fulfil their mission. They are always borne forward more or less unconsciously and passively, by the power of what they are; in another view, actively bringing to pass. In the case of Luther, this unpremeditated character of the relation in which he stood to his work comes everywhere into view. We feel the full force of it particularly, when we observe to what an extent it lay, not in his individual nature simply, not in what he was merely as a man, but in what he became himself, first of all, through the power of the Gospel, in the new Christian personality through which he was enabled to save himself from the wreck and chaos of his old life, before thinking of anything beyond himself. The whole sense of the Reformation lay in his own experience. He had lived himself, with mighty

birth-struggle, into its inmost principle, and felt the presence of it as a new creation in his soul, before he became unwittingly the organ of God's Spirit for proclaiming it, and heralding it to the world at large. "He did not set himself up to be a saint," says Dorner, "but he became of model, world-historical significance for the German mind, and far beyond, by being a man who had wrestled to find inward peace and direct communion with God—life-questions for the souls of all truly earnest and thoughtful men—and had not wrestled in vain. Having thus gone through conflict and victory in his own spirit, he committed his experiences, with eloquent faith, to the heart of his people, and so won among them the place of a competent and trustworthy leader in things pertaining to eternal salvation. True, he is a hero of the German *national* spirit, whose image even yet is of magical force for all circles, high or low; but not by his natural individuality as such, nor yet by his word as doctrine merely, has he made himself so enduringly felt; the secret of his power lies in all that served to form him to the type of an Apostolic disciple, and to an example, we will not say of the Christian life generally, but of conscious personal Christianity advanced to the ripeness of manhood—above all, in his clear, free apprehension of the way of salvation through Christ. His faith it was, emphatically, that gave him strength; and through this it became his life-work outwardly also, to open again to the free knowledge of every one the glory and power of the Gospel, and to lead even the simplest Christian to an experience of redemption, as direct and original as that by which he had himself been raised from death to life and from hell to heaven."

Dorner's history of Protestant Theology carries us back thus very properly to what may be considered the cradle of this new form of religion, as we have it offered to our view in the spiritual experience of Luther. To some it may seem not altogether satisfactory to find the movement referred in this way to so small and poor a beginning. They would be better pleased if it could be shown to have come with more outward observation and more general concert, more comprehensive consideration

and plan. But viewing Protestantism as a new creation, a re-organization in full of Christian life and doctrine, it is not easy to see how it could have deserved confidence in any other form so well as in that which here marks its origin in fact. No political authority, of course, could have inaugurated so vast a revolution (as in England) with the same title to respect; but neither would it have had so much the character and presumption of being a divine work, if it had been effected by an ecclesiastical council or a theological school. One of the most powerful arguments for the truth and right of the Lutheran Reformation, after all, will be found to lie in its origin, as the power of a new life in the man Luther himself, before it became a new form of doctrine either for himself or for the world at large. To be at all such a new creation as it has claimed to be, it *must* start in this way; it must be life first, like Christianity in the beginning, in order to become doctrine afterwards. Under no other view, we may add, does the character of Protestantism vindicate itself so clearly as being positive and not merely negative, the actual embracing of truth, and not a perpetual protest simply against supposed error. However it may have been with many calling themselves Protestants in later times, it is certain that with Luther himself, the father and fountain-head of German Protestantism in the sixteenth century, the interest of affirming the true sense of Christianity went before the interest of denying what was felt afterwards to contradict this sense. Religion for him was the most intense form of personal life; faith, the most positive apprehension of objective divine realities; without any thought at all, at first, of contradicting the authority of the reigning Church. The contradiction came at last only through the irrepressible force of what faith found itself constrained to confess and affirm. The positive can easily be seen to rule and determine the negative throughout. Confession first; then protest. Such is the honorable and only just sense of Protestantism, as it mirrors itself to our contemplation in the great soul of Martin Luther; and under no other view, certainly, can it so well lay claim to

historical justification, as being truly the work of God, and not simply the device and contrivance of men.

In the history before us we have first, then, a graphic sketch of the personal development of Luther as far as to the year 1517. In the next place it is shown how the faith that was in him became a principle of censure and reformation over against the abuses with which he found himself surrounded in the Church; how it brought him, without will or forethought of his own, more and more deeply and widely into conflict with the existing order of things; and how, at last, having passed in this way through successive stages of controversy and debate, it forced him finally to a full and complete rupture with the Papacy and all its powers. By this time the cause he represented had itself become a power, moving with irresistible force in its own direction. It had come to a happy union with learning and science through the university of Wittenberg, and a host of strength was added to it in the person of Melancthon. The principle of reform made itself felt as a witness against the errors of Rome on all sides. It was not enough, however, that it should assert itself simply in this way. As the power of a new positive creation, it must be able to limit and bound itself also on the opposite side, by withstanding successfully all forms of thought, which might seek to make common cause with it as against Rome, while yet they ran in fact toward the destruction of the true Gospel altogether. It was a vast peril to which the Reformation was exposed. in this way, from excesses and caricatures, that put themselves forward everywhere in its name, and claimed to be the only true and full expression of its sense; and nothing served more in the end to prove the substantive character of the movement, and to give assurance of its enduring success, than the way in which it refused to ally itself to these false tendencies, and held itself steadily to its own path. Here come into view Luther's controversies with such men as Carlstadt, with the Anabaptists, with false mysticism and radical subjectivism in all forms, with the Antinomians, with dreamers like Schwenckfeld on the one hand, and with moderatists like Erasmus on the other.

Through all these controversies, the principle of the Reformation, as it reigned in the mind of Luther, wrought as an organic force, gathering to itself what was congenial to its own nature and throwing off what was foreign and incongruous, strengthening itself continually by exercise and taking volume and form more and more, so as to bring out at last in full measure the actual presence and full grown proportions of a renovated Evangelical German Church. The reality and vital energy of the principle are powerfully demonstrated, by the power it had to maintain itself in this way. For Luther was no philosopher or scholastic theologian. His divinity was more intuitional always than logical. The Gospel was not with him, therefore, a given finished system of intellectual propositions, that might be applied mechanically to all occasions as they rose. It was the sense of a new life only, full of the most positive substance, which must work its way through all confusion and chaos to intelligible form. That it did so, without involving him in self-contradiction, without losing itself in vague uncertainty and doubt, so as to furnish consistent matter as it did for the vast structures of theology that come before us in the later scholastic period of the Lutheran Church, is something at which we may well marvel, and which rightly considered can hardly fail to inspire us with true reverence for the Reformation, as having been in very deed what may deserve to be called a new creation in the history of the Christian world.

And what now *was* the principle of this creation, the power that wrought organically to bring it to pass and to give it form? We may say in general, it was the union of faith with the word of God. The principle is thus of a compound character. It has two sides, which are frequently spoken of as being in fact two different principles; one underlying the matter of the Christian salvation, and the other determining its form. Where this distinction is made, the material principle is *justification by faith alone in Christ*, the formal principle is the *exclusive authority of the Holy Scriptures*. Luther allowed to both of these principles independent worth

and right, but so as to see clearly and turn to fruitful account, at the same time, their indissoluble connection. It is a most interesting inquiry, to ascertain how they were thus distinguished and yet brought together as a single power in his mind. No inquiry can be more important, either for the right understanding of the great Reformer himself, or for the right understanding of the Reformation. It may be considered indeed the necessary key, in some sense, for understanding rightly the universal history of Protestantism.

Justification by faith, that article of a standing or falling Church, was something very different with Luther from what it has been taken to be, by many who have made it their watch-word since his time. As the corner-stone of Christianity, it was for him, of course, vastly more than any doctrine simply bearing this title. The great truth, as he held it, was in the fullest sense spirit and life. In such form, it was anything but a subjective sentiment simply in the mind of the believer. How far this view has been allowed to run away with the doctrine, making it the vehicle of damnable falsehood, all may easily see and know. In one direction, we find it in the character of an abstract intellectual solifidianism, producing the most wretched carnal security and antinomian indifference to all good works. In another direction, it meets us in the shape of wild, fanatical sectarianism, scorning the outward word and sacraments, and resolving all religion into private inspiration and fancy—the very fiend of unsacramental *Schwärmerei*, with which Luther had to do battle, long and heavy, in defence of his own doctrine and cause. Then again it looks forth upon us, with a sort of cold Mephistopheles grin, from the camp of Liberal and Rationalistic Christianity, where it is made to be another word only for the rejection of all positive Christianity, and a general trust in God without any reference to Christ whatever. Thus it is, that errors from all points of the compass come together on this common confession of justification by faith; all claiming to be Protestant in the fullest and best sense of the term; and all arrogating to themselves

the title *evangelical*, as having in their own opinion exhausted the inmost marrow of the Gospel.

Alas for the article of a standing or falling Church, in such an evangelical Babel as this. Luther's principle was never intended certainly to take in forms of Christianity like these. On the contrary, it was intended to shut them out as unevangelical and false. With him, faith was far more than an opinion, judgment, sentiment, or merely subjective state of any kind. It was such an inward relation of its subject (the believer) to its proper object (Christ and his work—the Gospel in its true sense), as involved at once the real apprehension of the object in its own proper living form. Faith found its own necessary complement thus in that which it was brought to embrace; and what it embraced was no doctrine simply or outward word, but the actual living substance of the Gospel itself.

Regarded as the beginning of the Christian life, this faith must start, in the nature of the case, where the grace of redemption first reaches over into the consciousness of the sinner—must be an appropriation of God's mercy exhibited in the forgiveness of sin. It is thus justifying faith; because it sets its subject in felt, assured communication with the only ground of justification, the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ. In the apprehension of this sacrifice, however, it is not simply the doctrine of the atonement that is embraced; it is the living fact of the atonement itself, as being of perennial force to take away sin; and as this cannot for a moment be sundered from the person of the Saviour, it follows, that it is always Christ himself, who is thus embraced, under the view particularly of his priestly work, as the great object by which faith becomes efficacious here for the deliverance of the soul from the condemning and disabling power of sin.

Such faith is what it is, only by coming into real union with its object, and so causing its object to come into real union with its subject. It is at once in this way both of subjective and objective force. It assures the believer of his interest in Christ, and at the same time authenticates to him the truth of Christ

and the reality of the Gospel, as they can be authenticated to him without this by no argument or proof besides.

In this view, faith is with Luther an independent principle of evangelical truth, and not a secondary authority simply depending on the Bible. It is the direct apprehension of the truth itself, the seeing eye in actual vision, the immediate meeting of the soul with its proper life in Christ, which requires and allows no intervening mediation or condition. In such view, it cannot be said to rest on the authority of the written word, the assurance of any outward inspiration. It is *sui juris* in its own sphere, having to do only with the positive substance of the Gospel itself, back of all certification of what it is in any other way. It was not the authority of the Bible, that first brought Luther himself to the exercise of faith and the sense of justification. It was, he tells us, by having his attention turned to the article of the forgiveness of sins in the Apostles' Creed, that he came to lay hold of Christ in his own person, and was thus made to emerge from darkness into the marvellous light of the Gospel. His Christianity, like that of the first Christians, took root at once in the self-authenticating presence of the Christian salvation itself.

Luther's "justifying faith," let it be well considered then, was no apprehension simply of the merit of Christ in an abstract, impersonal view; it was the laying hold of the atonement in Christ, the atonement under a living, personal form. It embraced the whole Christ, and took in all his benefits potentially, no less than the forgiveness of sins. "Hence Luther," according to Dorner, "holds throughout (with the best later Lutheran theologians), that justifying faith, that is, the faith which appropriates justification, includes also love, and so in principle and germ at least the presence of good works. The believer remains not what he was before; not only is there a change of relation between him and God through the imputed merit of Christ, but his faith has brought into him also a new life. Faith is a new tree of life, which cannot but put forth the fruits of love and wisdom." Throughout, indeed, it is only the laying hold of the fact of God's mercy in Christ that justi-

fies us, and puts us in the way of becoming holy; but still our justification is the root of our sanctification. It is more than a simply forensic act, an outward thought on the part of God. What God thinks and speaks in the case, is necessarily of creative force for the soul into which his thought comes, and cannot fail to work productively there, as the power of a new consciousness and the principle of a regenerated life.

The position which Luther assigns to faith, as the material principle of Christianity over against the Bible, is wonderfully independent and free. He will know of no mechanical subjugation of the spirit here to a rule holding entirely beyond itself. Faith alone furnishes the key for the proper interpretation of the Bible. Faith must unfold and apply the sense of the Bible. Faith may sit in judgment even on the canon and text of the Bible. How far he carried this liberty of criticism himself, is well known. The Epistle of James he rejected altogether; and he was but little more indulgent towards the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse. He goes so far even as to say of an argument of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians, that it will not hold good; and he has no trouble in admitting, that not only St. Stephen, but the sacred writers themselves, are chargeable with inaccuracies. His views of the Old Testament are liberal in the extreme. The canon of the Scriptures is everywhere for him a still more or less open question. Some books are of higher worth than others. There are different degrees of inspiration. He distinguishes everywhere plainly, between the Divine word (the actual substance of revelation) and the written record we have of it in the Bible; and his whole view of inspiration implies that it is to be considered as of a historical, living character throughout, involving the human in the divine, under the most different modes and forms, and all in the freest possible way.

But with all this stress laid on the material principle, Luther is no less strong again in asserting the independence also of the formal principle of the Reformation, the exclusive authority of the Holy Scriptures over against every other rule of doctrine or life. So in his polemics with the Roman Church,

and so also in his polemics with the subjective fanaticism of the Anabaptists. Christ works continuously in the world through the outward word and sacraments; and he will hear of no Christianity that proceeds not from his presence among men in this form. The Holy Scriptures are the only infallible source for knowing what Christianity was in the beginning, the only sure measure and norm for determining what it is now. What faith certifies for truth must be tried continually by this rule.

Here seems to be a dilemma. How can these two principles each asserting its own independence, stand together in one and the same system? Luther enters into no formal conciliation of the difficulty. But it is practically solved for him by his sound Christian experience itself; and both principles flow together in his consciousness, as only different sides in fact of one and the same principle. Faith and the outward Word look to the same object and find their proper completeness in the same end. In their legitimate course then, they cannot come into real conflict. The guaranty of their full inward correspondence lies in their being true to themselves, and in their following, independently, each the law of its own nature. The Word demands faith as the necessary organ for its right apprehension; while faith seeks the Word as that which offers to it its own proper food and ministers continually to its growth and strength. Thus are they in mutual relation throughout, the material and formal sides simply of the same generating power, the principle which must be considered the root of all true Protestantism.

After the rise of Lutheranism, we have next, in Dorner's *Urzeit des Protestantismus*, a general survey of the origin of the Reformed Confession, as it rose in Switzerland simultaneously with the German movement. Full justice is done to its distinctive and independent character. It begins in a certain sense with Ulrich Zwingli; but he bears no such relation to it as that of Luther to the Reformation in Germany. His person is not for it at all of any like central and fundamental significance. He cannot be regarded as its original type. He is simply one among a number of others, who appear as leaders in a diffusive popular revolution, without owing to him particu-

larly their governing thought and spirit. There may have been some disadvantage in this; but it is easy to see in it also much advantage. It saved the Reformed Confession from the proprietorship of a human name. We feel at once how it must have been belittled and wronged, by becoming known as the *Zwinglian Church*. There was no possibility of that, even among the cantons of its native Switzerland; much less, as its lines went forth afterwards over Western Europe, through France and along the Rhine, to Holland, England, Scotland, and finally also far and wide over the Northern half of the New World. Over against this development, the person and name of Zwingli, with all that was generous in his nature or noble and heroic in his life, shrink deservedly into historical insignificance. In no sense can he be regarded as either the fountain or the foundation of the Reformed Church.

We have in the rise of the Reformed Church two stages; the first a sort of unripe preparation merely for the second, in which we reach at last its full confessional sense. It is only for the incipient stage that Zwingli can be said to have even relatively the character of a leader; and even here there was nothing strictly creative, as with Luther, in the working of his spirit. It had no power, except in part at Zurich, to impress itself permanently on the symbolical theology of the Church. The Swiss Confessions represent a later life.

There is a generic difference, of course, between the Lutheran and Reformed types of Protestantism. We will not pretend here to sketch it even in outline. It is not easy, indeed, to bring it to clear intellectual delineation; as is shown by the fact, that the best attempts which have been made to set the subject in proper light, besides conflicting with one another, are found in no case entirely satisfactory. But the difference itself admits of no question. It is of a kind to be felt, even where it cannot be fully understood or explained. The Reformers, on both sides, all felt it in the beginning; and it has perpetuated itself in the spirit of the two Confessions, through all changes they have suffered since, down to the present time. Yet has this felt difference never been of such sort,

at the same time, as to destroy absolutely the sense of a common life. Neither form of faith has been able to hold itself entirely independent of the other. There has been between them a mutual attraction, no less than a mutual repulsion. The full idea of Protestantism has been felt to require and embrace them both.

The Swiss movement thus, in the beginning, was regarded as kindred in full with the German. The difference between them came not at once into view. Their unity stood not only in their common opposition to Rome, but in their essential agreement besides with regard to the supreme authority of the Scriptures, and the freeness of God's grace in Christ; and then again in their common conservatism also over against false spiritualistic tendencies in the hyper-protestant direction. For the Swiss too had to defend their cause on this side in opposition to the religious anarchy both of the Anabaptists and of the Antitrinitarians. Still the constitutional difference of the Confessions was at hand also from the first; and it was not long before it began to make itself painfully felt. The occasion, as is well known, was the question of our Lord's presence in the Holy Eucharist.

According to Dr. Dorner, Zwingli's view of the Lord's Supper was not at first so different from that of Luther as to be a matter of particular observation; being substantially indeed, the same view that was received generally afterwards, through the influence of Calvin, into the Reformed Confessions, with which Luther himself, as we know, had no disposition to quarrel. He was led, however, through certain influences, gradually to shift his ground, and in the year 1524 proclaimed, in his celebrated letter to Matthew Alber, what was felt to be on all sides a doctrine at full variance with the Lutheran. This became the signal for sharp controversy, leading to much bitterness and provocation, and tending of course toward extreme positions on both sides. That Zwingli's sacramental doctrine now had become poor and low, and much of one sort with the rationalistic theory that prevails among so called evangelical sects of modern times generally, admits of no question, and is

practically proved by the fact of its subsequent repudiation on the part of the Swiss Churches themselves. Calvin, we know, went so far as to pronounce it profane. Even Zwingli himself seems to have returned again, before he died, to better thoughts on the subject, by which room was made for the Marburg Conference in 1529; the beginning of a peace between the contending parties, which reached its consummation, after his death, in the memorable Wittenberg Concord of 1536. This carries us over what may be called the first comparatively unripe stage of development in the Primitive History of the Reformed Church.

Having come thus far, the work before us advances to a third main division of its First Book, devoted to the object of representing the movement of the doctrinal life of both Confessions on to its symbolical conclusion, as this is reached for the Lutheran Church in 1580 by the Form of Concord, and for the Reformed Church in 1620 by the Articles of the Synod of Dort.

The first section of this division gives us a comprehensive view of the vast internal conflicts, through which the Lutheran doctrine was brought to complete itself in this way for the Lutheran consciousness, in what was supposed to be its necessary ultimate form. Dorner sees in these violent theological struggles, of course, a steady historical movement toward a determinate general end. They reduce themselves for him to six main controversies, falling into three counterpart pairs: first, the *Antinomian* and the *Majoristic*; then, the *Osiandrian* and the *Stancarian*; and finally, the *Synergistic* and the *Flaccian*. "On first view," we are told, "the controversies here named present a show of the greatest confusion, especially as the parties concerned in them figure in all sorts of cross combinations; the same combatants appearing as allies in one case and then again as opponents in another. In this we may see a proof, that it was not the conscious spirit of faction, but an honest regard for the cause, that determined party lines in each case. We may see, moreover, in the coming up of the controversies by pairs, how doctrines developed themselves historically through onesided antagonistic extremes, working from opposite

directions for mutual correction, and serving to bring out in full, sharp force and expression at last what each doctrine properly meant. In such view, these complicated struggles for the right apprehension of the reformation principle (necessarily more or less defective in the beginning), must be regarded as answering a most important purpose in bringing out the true sense of the Reformation. Looked at in this way, the controversial chaos shapes itself into comparative order and light. In spite of human passion and accident, it is found to proceed in the whole with regular onward movement. First, in the Antinomian and Majoristic extremes, the strife turns on the law and its significance, as forming the preliminary threshold to the right understanding of the doctrine of free grace. Next, through the ultraisms of Osiander and Stancarus, we are brought to a close determination of what is comprehended in the idea of justifying faith and the forgiveness of sin through Christ's person and work, the Gospel, in other words, under its objective view. All of which is followed up then in the third place, by the discussion of the subjective side of our salvation, involving the question of freedom and grace, as we have it in the Synergistic and Flaccian controversies. This completes the circle of principal questions.⁴ In all these controversies, it is at last a mediating view, between opposing extremes, that comes in the end to symbolical authority (though not everywhere with like satisfaction) in the Form of Concord.⁵

It is easy to see how our History, following out this general scheme, is able to make the study of the tumultuous theological period to which it belongs, both interesting and profitable.

From the Lutheran Confession thus advanced to the high position of the Form of Concord, our attention is in the next place turned once more to the Reformed Church; whose orphaned condition after the death of Zwingli and Oecolampadius found, we are told, in the person and character of the great Calvin a new centre, and it may be said, the soul of a new life also; in the power of which it entered upon the second stadium of its general birth-period, and attained the full confessional form under which it appears in its later symbols.

We cannot pretend, of course, to generalize here, even in the broadest way, our author's very favorable estimate of Calvin's character, or the view he presents of the Calvinistic theology in its relations to the Lutheran. The two-fold principle of the Reformation (as at once material and formal), he finds distinctly recognized by the Reformer of Geneva, no less than by Luther and Melancthon; though not without some variation of apprehension, answering to the general differing standpoints of the two Confessions. This divergency of view, in reference both to the nature of justifying faith and to the authority of the Scriptures, needs to be well studied and laid to heart, for a right knowledge of the Reformed Church, and for the full understanding of the History of Protestantism generally. But we can say no more of it at the present time.

We must not omit, however, to bring forward Dorner's testimony in regard to Calvin's sacramental doctrine; "in which, as well as in the articles of sin, guilt and justification, he sought to come nearer than Zwingli to Luther;" and which entered subsequently also, we are told, into all the later and more important symbolical books of the Reformed Church—the low view of Zwingli finding in this period no favor among them whatever. The sacraments, according to this old Reformed doctrine, are not naked signs simply, nor acts merely of thankfulness or confession on our part, but pledges and seals of God's actually present grace, at once mysterious and efficacious. Such is Calvin's view of Baptism; and such also his view of the Lord's Supper. Christ, he tells us, cannot be sundered from his benefits. We partake of these only by partaking of his person. The matter and substance of the Holy Supper, then, is Christ himself in his true human life, and all the grace of the sacrament flows from this substance. The symbols in the Supper not only represent, but exhibit and offer actually what they represent; the signs are conjoined with that which they signify. Not by transmutation or natural alligation in any way, but through Christ's word and the transcendent working of the Holy Ghost.

Luther was willing to be satisfied with Calvin's sacramental

doctrine, as published a. 1540 in his tract *de Coena Domini*; and it was favorably received by the Lutheran Church generally. Still it was not in full harmony with the more rigorous thinking of that Confession; and we need not wonder, therefore, that it failed in the end to bring the Helvetic and German Churches together, and only opened the way for a second sacramental war more violent altogether than that which had ended in the Wittenberg Concord.

There are still those in this country who allow themselves to disown (with a sort of wilful obscurantism) what we have shown heretofore, in the Mystical Presence and elsewhere, to have been the Calvinistic doctrine of the Lord's Supper, as it was held by Calvin himself and adopted by the later and better Reformed symbols of the sixteenth century. They refuse not merely the doctrine itself, as they must necessarily do from their Puritanic standpoint; but they disown also the fact of its past existence, requiring history to suit itself to their own theological preconceptions. It is some satisfaction to be able to confront this stubborn humor with the clear judgment and testimony of such a witness as Dorner, in the way we have it here given with regard to the whole subject. He even goes so far as to refer with approbation to our tract, *The Doctrine of the Reformed Church on the Lord's Supper* 1850, as full of proof for the case, and notes it as something strange in another place, that for thus "bringing the genuine doctrine of Calvin to mind, and bewailing the evils of the sect system," we should have fallen with many in America into the reproach of Romanizing.

Our obscurantists (whether among ourselves or in other denominations) may as well make up their mind to yield the *historical* question with a good grace. Calvin saw in the Lord's Supper no outward show only, no theatrical pomp, no mere imagination or mental conception. "Christ's humanity (*caro*) is life-giving, not simply as that through which our salvation has been once obtained, but because now also, in our growing union with him, his body breathes life into us, because, in short, through the mysterious power of the Spirit, which resides in

Christ's body, we have a common life with him. For from the secret fountain of the Godhead life has been wonderfully poured into the body of Christ, in order that it might from this reservoir flow over to his people. Spiritual presence here must not be taken to exclude actual presence; and if by *real* we are to understand *true* simply, as the opposite of fancy or show, then was he (Calvin) willing to allow the term *real* presence; for he meant nothing less than a real participation of the Saviour's body. Only he was not willing to have this understood in any common physical sense, at war with the proper conception of Christ's glorified, spiritual or pneumatic being. Like the sun, Christ streams into us the vivific energy of his flesh (*vivificum carnis suae vigorem in nos transfundit, non secus ac vitali solis calore per radios vegetamur*). Himself in heaven, he yet descends to us by his power, and works in us, breathing life into us from his body's substance. The mediating principle of this world-transcending communication is what Calvin calls the mirifical agency of the Holy Ghost, working in believers a spiritual lifting up of the soul, answerable to the *sursum corda* of the old Liturgies. For it is only the organ of faith that can receive Christ—any other view must sever him from the Holy Ghost. Not that unbelief can alter the nature of the sacrament; that would make God dependent on his creature; but it is only faith that *can* receive the offered blessing, which is immediately spiritual, although it becomes through faith of bodily force also in the end. The powers that proceed from Christ's body he seems to regard as the power also of the Holy Ghost, who however is sent from Christ, issues forth indeed from his humanity itself, to effect union with him. This union is for Calvin then a lifting up of the soul into heaven, though not of course in the sense of its quitting the body as in ecstasy or trance."

This is the Calvinistic doctrine of the mystical presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper; which entered into the Reformed confessional symbols generally, in the second half of the sixteenth century; and which substantially is now embodied in the eucharistic service of the new *Order of Worship*, lately pre-

pared for our American German Reformed Church. The consecratory prayer in that service runs: "Almighty God, our heavenly Father, send down, we beseech Thee, the powerful benediction of Thy Holy Spirit upon these elements of bread and wine, that being set apart now from a common to a sacred and mystical use, they may exhibit and represent to us with true effect the Body and Blood of Thy Son, Jesus Christ; so that in the use of them we may be made, through the power of the Holy Ghost, to partake really and truly of His blessed life, whereby only we can be saved from death, and raised to immortality at the last day. *Amen.*" That this should be felt not to tally with the common unsacramental thinking of the present time, is not strange. It was not intended to do so. It was intended to be a solemn protest against all such grossly palpable defection from the old faith, whether found among ourselves or in other branches of the Reformed Church (Congregationalist, Low Dutch, Presbyterian, or Methodist); or a thing more monstrous to think of still, in large portions even of our American Lutheran profession itself! But there is not a clause or word in the form, that is not in strict agreement with the Calvinistic or old Reformed doctrine; and only theological blindness can see in it, or theological perverseness pretend to see in it, either the Roman Catholic dogma of transubstantiation, or the so-called consubstantiation of the Church of Luther.

The last portion of this part of Dorner's work sketches the history of the Reformed Church, theologically considered, after the death of Calvin, through the Arminian controversy, particularly in Holland, down to the meeting of the General Synod of Dort; which may be said to have closed in a sense the period of confessional production for this Church, as it had come to its end also for the Lutheran Church, some time before, through the bringing out of the Form of Concord.

Thus we reach the conclusion of what our author considers to be the *Urzeit* of Protestantism, its primordial creative period, in which we have the bursting forth of its first general life, and the production of the still more or less unorganized

material of its subsequent history. It forms, as we have before said, the subject of the first book of his work, and takes up nearly one-half of its nine hundred and twenty-four octavo pages. We shall not follow him any farther at present. We may, however return to his History again in some future article for the MERCERSBURG REVIEW. Should we be permitted to do so, we shall find the subject full of difficulty, but at the same time profoundly interesting, and of the most awakening religious solemnity. It goes to the foundations of our Protestant life, and has to do with the deepest Christian problems of the age.

One great object with Dorner in his first book, is to bring clearly into view the original and only proper sense of the material principle of Protestantism, as it conditioned and determined also, at the same time, the sense of its formal principle. On these two grand hinges, in right relation to one another, justification by faith and the exclusive authority of the Scriptures, the universal weight of the Reformation must necessarily rest and turn. But the only real foundation of Christianity, objectively considered, is Christ himself. Great stress then is laid here on the thought, that justifying faith, in the Reformation sense of the term, amounted to a real self-authenticating apprehension of Christ's righteousness through an actual laying hold of his person and life. In other words, that in which Christianity started within the soul, was held to be not just the idea of the atonement after all; but this idea lodged in the Incarnate Word, as the power of salvation back of all Christ's doings and merits in any farther view. This is all very well, and as we believe profoundly true. The article of a standing or falling Church becomes thus Christological, in the fullest sense of the term. It centres upon the person of Christ, and has no meaning or truth in any other view. Dorner sees well, that in no other view can there be any room to speak either of theological consistency or of historical continuity for Protestantism; without this, it must resolve itself into endless confusion and chaos. We may well say, therefore, that in thus maintaining the Christological sense of Luther's doctrine of justification by

faith, Dorner has in truth planted himself on what must be considered the very Gibraltar of the Protestant cause, if that cause is to be successfully defended at all on strictly Protestant ground.

But has Dr. Dorner now shown himself faithful to his great position, in making no more of it than he has done for the historical treatment of his subject? With all our respect for his high name, we must say that we think not. We cannot help feeling, all through his History, a certain theological inconsistency, by which he allows his view of the ultimate significance of Christ's person for the Gospel, to stop short with what it is in one direction only (the atoning virtue of his death as apprehended by justifying faith), while no like account is made apparently of what it must necessarily be also in other directions. Is it only the priestly office and work of Christ, then, that have their root in his person? Is not his person just as much the root also of his prophetical office and work; and so again the root no less of his kingly office and work? It will not do to confine the Christological principle here, as Dorner appears to do, and as seems to have been done in some measure also by the Reformers of the sixteenth century, to its bearing on the cardinal interest of the atonement. The whole Gospel starts in Christ, the mystery of the incarnation, the coming together of God and man in his person. This is the beginning and foundation of all that follows; and in taking in this, the faith that gives us an interest in the atonement (the material principle of Protestantism) brings into us in truth the power of his universal life, as related to the purposes of our salvation. All this we have in the Creed. There Christianity begins in Christ, and rolls itself forward in the grand and glorious life-stream of the Church. The forgiveness of sins (on which Luther first fastened the anchor of his faith) is there in its proper place; but there too are other articles, supposed to be comprehended with equal necessity in the Christian mystery—*God manifest in the flesh*. There in particular is the article of the Church, drawing after it unquestionably, not only the idea of sacramental grace which Dorner admits, but the

idea also of an Apostolical ministry by Divine consecration (as we have it in Eph. iv. 7-15), which Dorner takes pains, if we understand him properly, to let us know he does not admit. Here, we say, we feel his whole position, and the whole argument of his History to be unsatisfactory and wrong; and just here, as we have had occasion to say before, we break with the modern German theology generally, much as we admire it otherwise, because we find it untrue to its own Christological principle. The virus of Erastianism is everywhere in its veins. We are willing to meet all parties, German or English, on the basis of the Apostles' Creed; but, God helping us, we will not consent to stand with any of them anywhere else.

ART. V.—SCHELLING'S IDEA OF ACADEMIC CULTURE.

Vorlesungen ueber die Methode des Academicischen Studium, von F. W. J. Schelling, Stuttgart und Tübingen, 1830.

Schelling very properly introduces his Lectures on Culture with the remark, that discussions of this kind are important, not only to the teacher and student, but also in the direct bearing they have on the progress, tendency and character of science itself. Schools of learning, if they be pervaded with anything like life and power, and are not simply the tread-mills of a dead routine of worn out traditions, may, therefore, be expected to exert an influence that goes beyond the college walls, and be felt in every sphere of life, but especially in the impulse and direction they give to the pursuit of knowledge under all its diversified forms. This remark seems to be conclusively verified by the lectures before us. Whilst they throw much light on what might be called the German idea of education, they at the same time present the sciences in their proper organic connection with each other, and invest them with a dignity and value, which they would in vain claim as they stand by themselves, in-

dependent of all such general relation. The lectures, indeed, apart from the philosophy of culture, with which they abound, are equally as rich and suggestive as it regards the philosophy of knowledge or science. They embrace, in a brief, and as might be supposed, comprehensive form, the philosophy of Schelling, the best and the most Christian, approximately, of the modern German systems; not so clearly understood by themselves, but interpreted in the light of his latter writings, clear and intelligible enough to every one, who is willing to give them a careful perusal.

It is, however, mainly on account of the many striking, profound and original thoughts in regard to higher educational training, with which they abound, that we bring them before the readers of this Review. They will not in fact be found to be entirely new to many of them, whom they will no doubt remind of the culture, which they themselves received at our own institutions both at Mercersburg and Lancaster.

According to Schelling, and all others, with whom the work of education is a matter of the heart, the student as he enters upon his academic career, needs constant counsel, direction, and guidance in his studies. As the world of knowledge opens up to his view, he feels instinctively that here, at least, there ought to be unity, order and harmony; but in that same degree, in which he feels this necessity, must he also be oppressed with the feeling, that he stands in a world of chaos, in which he sees nothing in its true and proper place; or, out on the wide ocean, without compass, chart, or guiding star. Few, can depend on their own internal resources, to direct them to anything like a rational end or object of pursuit. Many endowed with good organizing heads and hearts warm with love for study, at the start, feel as if it was their business to master every branch of knowledge and manifest the most commendable enthusiasm in the pursuit; but, as they study without regard to order or system, they are at the mercy of multifarious tendencies, and without penetrating to the germ of any subject studied, they find, after they have learned something by experience, that they have also learned much that is of no account, whilst they have ne-

glected much that is truly valuable. Others possessed of less sterling qualities, appalled at once by the magnitude and range of knowledge, become resigned to what seems to be their lot,— to herd with the commonalty, to give up all aspirations for a higher, spiritual education, and, as a consequence, to strive, by forced efforts of industry and mechanical memory, to master only such branches of knowledge as may be of use to them in promoting their future material prosperity. Or, as might be expected, with no safe guide, or no resources within themselves, to give direction to their studies, they fall under the influence of bad teachers, with whose lower grade of cultivation they can more readily sympathize. From these considerations it will appear that students need direction in their academical pursuits; and of course, the novel practice of allowing them to select for themselves the branches which they wish to study, in the same style as guests at a hotel select from a bill of fare such articles as they suppose will make them a good dinner, would be ruled out in every system of education, which claims for itself a rational or scientific character.

But there is a consideration, upon which Schelling properly lays great stress, for the most part overlooked in the practical education of our times. Universally, the particular has value only as it stands in living connection with the general, which is something higher and more permanent. This, of course, is no less true in education than in the arts and sciences, and there must be, accordingly, two kinds of culture, one that is general or universal, the other specific or particular, a distinction of much importance, and one that lies at the foundation of all culture as a real, living process. But as experience goes to show, especially in our own country, the object of most persons, who aspire to what is regarded as a liberal education at college or university, is not so much a generous, an ennobling universal culture, as something in itself of priceless value, as it is to become eminent as a good engineer, a good lawyer, a good doctor, or a successful preacher. The consequence is, that the true mission of the educated man is very indifferently fulfilled. The community, and especially the uneducated classes, instinc-

tively look up to those who are educated as models of manhood, and not simply as professional men, who for a consideration will look after our bodies, our souls, or our temporal possessions. They expect to see, as they have a right to do, in those occupying such prominent positions, the highest examples of culture and refinement, of intelligence and nobility of character. And when these are wanting, law, medicine, and divinity are no longer professions, but simply trades, and just as likely to secure for themselves nicknames, indicative of quackery and vulgarity, if not of meanness itself. Against such a one-sided culture, colleges and universities, where the more general sciences are studied, have to a greater or less extent endeavored to protect the student; and it cannot be denied that the academical course pursued in our better institutions of learning, so far as it goes, is well adapted to secure this object. Mathematics, in particular, as a purely ideal science, having nothing to do with material substances, purifies the mind and prepares it for the reception of rational knowledge of every other kind. But as Schelling maintains, philosophy, which touches the human subject on all sides, is especially adapted to elevate the mind above the limitations of a one-sided culture into the realms of the universal and absolute. As the universal science, the science of science, as the organizing power in the domain of knowledge, which professes to reduce an almost interminable diversity to a transparent unity, philosophy, if there be such a thing, certainly has the strongest claims to be regarded as the *sine qua non* in all true culture. It is absolutely essential to the idea of a full and complete education, which to have *reality* must be special, but to have *truth* must also be general. Here, then, we may say, we have the idea of all true culture or education.

But just here the student's difficulty commences. He is not exactly in a position to see for himself such a living connection between what is universal and specific in culture; and philosophy, that ethereal mistress of the sciences, dwells so much on her azure heights, that she seldom descends far enough to point out this connection; so that the ingenuous youth, who is not

unwilling to be led by universal, transcendental, absolute ideas, is tempted, through sheer dismay, to give up the pursuit altogether, rather than to waste his time in fruitless efforts to orient himself within such captivating regions. This remark, we think, has much force as it regards German philosophers generally, at least to an American mind, though it must be confessed, that we cannot complain so much of Schelling, in this respect, as of Hegel and others. He had a much higher regard for realities, and possessed, moreover, a wonderfully creative, an almost poetic genius, and has probably succeeded better than his compeers in showing the true, normal connection between the universal and particular in the wide range of knowledge.

The case, however, is not a hopeless one, nor should any one, much less a youth, who aspires to be a *free man*, and not a mere hod-carrier in science despond, nor imagine that it is his lot to be excluded from the region of the universal. Citizenship there may always be obtained by honest effort for its attainment.

Much will be accomplished, if the student is merely taught that there is such an organic unity in the domain of the sciences; that it is important that he should know something of the irrelative position in this totality; that there is a general life or spirit, which gives beauty and harmony to the whole; and that his future profession, whatever it may be, must be to him as well as to others a dead, spiritless, one-sided, contracted affair, which he cannot fill with becoming dignity and self-respect, except as he has some definite conception of its relation to other callings, and to that grand organism of which our universal human life consists.

So also the courage and strength of the student to acquire such a culture will be vastly increased, if he looks at the signs of the times, and sees how urgent and important it is in the deeply interesting period of history in which his lot is cast. Sixty years ago, when Schelling was only thirty years of age, he recognized the deeper tendencies of history towards unity, and seemed to foresee what is coming to pass under our own

eyes at the present time. What he said in his own day is finding ample fulfilment in our own: "that everything in art and science seems to suffer violence in its struggle toward unity, laying hold of every element in its sphere, even what is apparently the most insignificant, and marshalling it into line; whilst the slightest movement at the centre is sure to propagate itself with amazing rapidity to all the parts or members however remote; and a new and more general theory is called for, that is capable of comprehending all the facts in the case. Such an epoch, he remarks, cannot pass by without the birth of a new world, in which those who have no active sympathy must be entombed or reduced to nonentities. This powerful undercurrent towards unity, which the penetrating philosophers of Germany long ago detected in their times, and which their philosophy had much to do in originating and promoting, has shown itself within the last few years on a gigantic scale. Look, for instance, at Germany herself, which, in a brief period a little more than a year ago, by one grand leap, made such a huge advance towards national unity, the goal for which her people have been longing for centuries. Look also at Italy and England, and even Spain, which has been struggling for a higher unity and a better organization now for many years. At the late outbreak of our own troubles, a distinguished English statesman asserted that, as it is the lot of some nations to go on towards a greater degree of consolidation, so it is the manifest destiny of the Anglo-Saxon race to split and divide itself, and a very general fear that this would prove true in regard to ourselves came to prevail among ourselves during the war. But notwithstanding these predictions, and notwithstanding the fact, that the war was precipitated upon us by anarchic, disintegrating elements in the north as well as in the south, the result was an emphatic assertion of the principle of unity, a veritable *lucus a non lucendo*, a transformation of the everlasting Satanic Nay into the divine, the ever blessed Yea, in which disunion itself may be said to have wrought out the beautiful problem of our national unity. These and other facts of the same import are, however, only typical, we have reason to suppose, of a deeper, though less

palpable movement in the spiritual world towards law, unity, harmony and freedom. They speak volumes of hope and good news for science, philosophy, for theology, and above all for the Church of Christ and humanity at large. Now, the work of education, if it is to be a living thing, and not a mere dead tradition, cannot allow itself to make no account of these controlling tendencies, these life powers of history. It must partake of the character of the age; it must lay aside its exclusive particularism and strive after universalism and catholicity. It is only in this way that young men at school or college, to whom the control of this world-regenerating process must be soon entrusted, can be at all properly prepared to attend intelligently to their high and responsible duties. A single graduate, possessed of this kind of universal culture, is worth five hundred others, who have gone through a routine of studies with a keen eye to their future success in business or a profession, but without such an ennobling comprehension of himself and his work in one grand process or totality. This kind of education presupposes a love for the universal, the absence of onesidedness; and it must, therefore, be acquired, if acquired at all, for the most part, in youth, whilst the individual has enthusiasm and susceptibility, and has not yet been petrified by outward forms, and the claims of the business world have not as yet crushed out all the germs of a higher and nobler existence.

But where shall such a culture be obtained, and to whom shall the student entrust himself in this important matter. In the first place, we answer this question, by referring the student to himself and his better genius as a safe guide. Let him bring himself to see and feel for himself, that he is not merely a citizen of some little pent up Utica, but of the world at large; that he is a living member of nature and a factor in the world's history; let him know that neither the one nor the other is a mass of dead-matter, but that each is an organic process proceeding from one Author: and when he once sees this, he has the key of all knowledge, and of all true culture; and it will only be a question of time, whether he will make any progress

in the acquisition of true wisdom. Still here, as elsewhere, he needs the enlightening and enlivening power of the teacher's presence and the teacher's words; and, as a matter of course, he should be directed to such teachers as believe in the universal, and have given proof of their capacity to show that there is such a thing as universal science, a knowledge of knowledge, and have enthusiasm enough to awaken in others a love for universal thoughts and ideas. It will not do, therefore, to go to those who do not believe in philosophy, who profess not to understand such mysticism, and who try to throw cold water on everything that savors of true philosophical enthusiasm; nor to those who are so devoted to specialties, as to ignore or forget that there are entire worlds beyond their own little gardens, which they have cultivated with such exquisite care and attention. Specialties are, of course, proper in their place; but they are truly valuable only as they stand in an ennobling general culture, as their proper maternal soil. Accordingly, we say, we ought not to confine ourselves to such countries as Great Britain or our own, immersed as they are to a great extent in gross materialism, much of whose philosophy consists in stubborn efforts to prove that there is no such a thing as philosophy properly so called; but, proving all things and holding fast to that which is best, we should extend our tour to such a country as Germany, the classic soil of rational philosophy, where more perhaps than anywhere else the ideal world has something of the character of reality, and the real has been truly ennobled by its elevation into the region of the ideal. We may here also point to our own institutions, where some account has been made of a spiritual way of thinking; where philosophy, Christian philosophy has all along maintained a greater predominance than in any other institution in the country.

Now the kind of culture here advocated depends on the view which is taken of knowledge as a whole; upon the question whether there is such a thing as a science of knowledge, or whether all true knowledge is so inwardly connected, and connected as to form a single unity. Schelling tries to show that this is so by means of the fundamental principle of his

philosophy, his far famed *Identitäts-Lehre*. With him it was an object to avoid the absolute idealism of his friend, Fichte, whose system seemed to divest the external world of all outward objective existence, and to reduce all knowledge to mere inward subjective states or conditions of the mind. The claims of the real world entered, therefore, largely into Schelling's system of thinking, and were abundantly sustained amidst the wide-spread scepticism of the times. Not however to founder on a rock on the opposite shore, because men in trying to avoid one extreme are prone to run into another, he held just as firmly to the ideal world as he did to the real. He maintained that, so far from there being anything like opposition or antagonism between the two, as might be inferred from the contentions that have been continually springing up between them from the early dawn of philosophy, back to the times of Thales and Pythagoras, they are identical. This identity, however, can never be felt nor maintained except as these two orders of existence are seen to proceed and flow from a higher unity in what he calls the absolute, which is God, the source of all the diversified activities, which we witness in the sphere of nature and mind, and, at the same time the light, which discloses to us their relations to each other and to the whole system in which they stand.

Of course, it is not necessary here to show how Schelling attempted to trace out the process by which the endless diversity, which we witness within and without us, unfolds itself out of an original unity. Here he displayed a range of intellect, an architectonic skill and power, which must fill his readers with amazement at the resources of his mind. He has perhaps not succeeded in all respects with the solution of this vast problem; and certainly not in the view of the philosophic world. It would indeed be strange if he had, when we consider the slow process, which has as yet been made in unfolding the mysteries of the universe and our own being. Philosophy to be a science, must not necessarily have accomplished this fact. Pythagoras, from a feeling of disgust at the pretensions of those who claimed that they knew all things, was unwilling that

it should even be called wisdom, *σοφία*, and so gave it the more modest title *φιλοσοφία*, the love of wisdom, the name, which it still bears. From this it would appear, that it is not bound to give a complete intuition of all truth, but that it is rather, as its name imports, a striving after truth, and communion with its source in God. It is enough for us to know that there is such a thing as truth, underlying the universe, and that it is all one organic process, whether it has been presented to our view in a perfect outward objective system or not. Plato may have failed in this as we know he did, and so may Fichte, Hegel and Schelling; still that does not invalidate the position, that there is such a thing as philosophy, a universal, necessary truth; just as little as the divergent systems of Christianity prove that there is no true Christianity in the world.

Of course, if there be no such unity embracing all branches of knowledge, there is no need of further discussion, and our only alternative is to fall back upon our old treadmills, and grind away stubborn facts and old traditions as best we can. There can be no such a thing as a universal culture; no such a process as a *humanizing* process going forward in the elevation of our race; it is all relative, empirical, local, limited to times, places, and circumstances. But it would be difficult to admit all this in the face of history, and the universal tendency of men everywhere to philosophize from the shoemaker's bench up to the Academy, the Lyceum, and the University. In special branches of knowledge an internal unity is always regarded as a postulate, as a necessary preliminary condition. Each science tends to form itself into an organism, pervaded with a common life or spirit, which its professor borrows from the world of ideas. This is the case, for instance, with the science of Mathematics, which is constructed out of principles borrowed from a world beyond that which is real and tangible. Numbers, quantities, points, lines, surfaces, triangles, and spheres, are not there considered as things that can be seen or handled, but as ideas. These enter into the formation of the science as their life-blood, just as they entered at first into the creation of the material universe. But, if special sciences are

thus organically connected in themselves, why should we not suppose that they are organically related to each other so as to form one beautiful whole? The knowledge of this unity and of its principle forms a species of rational, unconditioned science, an *Urwissen*, out of which, in different grades, numerous branches unfold themselves in symmetrical order, so as to form in the end, that grand majestic tree of wisdom, under whose overhanging boughs the nations sit in admiration.

All this is confirmed by the results of science as they are brought to light from day to day. Not only do special departments of nature show in themselves an organic process, but many indubitable and well-defined traces have been brought to our knowledge from the sphere of nature as a whole. Geology has shown that our globe is not what it now is by virtue of any sudden or magical power, but that it is the result of a process or genesis, carried forward for a long period under the constant direction of the Divine mind. Traces of this progress towards the present mature form of our planet, properly called "footsteps of the Creator," are seen everywhere, on the tops and sides of mountains, deep down in mines, or in the bed of the ocean. Every where are indications and proofs that it was once without form and void, and that it rose out of chaos as a growth, as an objective, intellectual system. Astronomy here joins hands with Geology, confirms its results, and soaring aloft into the wide universe, predicates its unity, and maintains that the whole system of material things out to the most distant fixed star, is the result of a still grander process, of a simply genetic development of divine activities and thoughts. Thus, we may say, that all the discoveries in nature go to establish the intuitions of science, and to confirm that earnest conviction which Christianity has fixed in the human mind, that as there is only one God, so must unity, harmony, and order, every where characterize his works.

Knowledge is then organic, no less than nature and history, of which it is the other side, that is, the ideal. This brings us to a point of view from which we may at once see the value and dignity of science in general as well as of particular departments

of knowledge, as means to the highest culture of man. Each is a free unity by itself, and is in itself an end. No one science can be regarded as a means to another, nor is it to be regarded as such in any course of education. Thus it is often urged, in colleges and elsewhere, that philosophy and metaphysics are of no real value, except as they sharpen the intellect, and thus prepare the student to master other sciences more practical and useful. So, on the other hand, it is equally as great a mistake to suppose that the natural sciences have their use only as they serve the interests of those that are more intellectual. Such an idea of science is a purely mechanical one, and does violence to that organic relation in which they stand to each other, and that living unity which holds them together in mutual dependence. If one branch of knowledge is not its own end, but only a means to some other one, it becomes difficult for the student to have much respect for it, and he must study it very mechanically; whilst the professor, under the impression that he is simply carrying up brick and mortar through the hot sun to the top of the building, can hardly be expected to engage in his work with a high degree of enthusiasm. All branches of knowledge are doubtless mutually dependent on each other, and some are more important than others. They mutually shed light on each other, and no one can be fully understood without some knowledge of the rest. But it is derogatory to any one if its value is made to depend simply on its relation to some other one co-ordinate with itself. Each is an end in itself, whilst all in their turn become a means in their relation to the totality in which they find their life and truth. So it is in the State, which is perfect and entire only as its branches or departments of life and activity are left free to unfold themselves in harmony with its general life, without bar or hindrance from the other. So also in the work of education. "The more," says Schelling, "the teacher regards his department as an end, the more even he makes it the middle point of all knowledge, and strives to extend it into an all comprehensive totality, so much the more will he endeavor to invest it with general and universal ideas; whilst, on the other hand, the

less he is able to give it a universal sense or meaning, whether he is conscious of it or not, he will give it the mechanical character of mere means; because that which is not clearly comprehended as an end, by a sort of inevitable necessity, will come to be used as means, and must to that extent be degraded." Must then every teacher be a philosopher in order that he may do justice to his department? We answer, certainly, as much so as possible; and the more so, the more likely it is that he will give to his science the interest of a new charm, and awaken in the minds of his students a sense for the universal in full sympathy with his own. This also implies that philosophical training should not be put off until the student gets away up somewhere in the university, where it is served out to him in order, in a few lectures near the end of his course. No more so, we would again say, than that this should be the case with the moral, the aesthetical, or the religious, all of which imply the highest flights of philosophy. All training should be philosophical, just as it should be ethical and theological. The tendency to generalize, to organize our ideas, to philosophize, often shows itself quite early in youth, with other noble tendencies of our nature, and it should therefore meet with encouragement by providing for it a congenial atmosphere from the start no less than at the end of a course of study. We are all more or less by nature philosophers as well as theologians, and what we need most in these circumstances is encouragement and right direction to these tendencies. The school, therefore, which can impart no genial impulse in this direction, is sadly defective in that which should constitute its very life as a seminary of learning; and the teacher or professor, no matter what may be his enthusiasm for his science, becomes one-sided, and is stripped of all power of reaching and stirring up the deeper and more powerful instincts and tendencies of human nature. Religion and morals may be taught, but it will be done, for the most part, in an outward, mechanical way. These interests have life and power only as they appear in their proper place and connection in the system to which they belong. Not even Logic or Mathematics can be taught with safety, unless

the instructor fully understands their connections and relations. If he be an unbeliever, indifferent about truth, or unable to defend it, the case is still worse, and involves danger to the interests of education. It is an instance in which the individual has no proper call to his work.

We have thus seen what relation the co-ordinate branches of knowledge sustain to each other, and to that totality in which they all meet; we have also seen with what spirit the particular branches should be studied. The particular must never be subordinate to itself, but owes in all cases its homage to the general. Thus education becomes general and universal, and as such is also an end in itself; and it ought never to be regarded as a mere means. It is, of course, an essential and necessary preparation for the learned professions, such as law, divinity; for experience goes to show that these callings cannot be filled with dignity and honor, without something like the universal education which we have been advocating. But if this is the only or the main object of an academical training, it is reduced to a system of hod-carrying on a more extensive scale than in the case which has been considered, in which one branch of science is prostituted to serve the interests simply of another. We cannot speak in terms too exalted of the dignity of the learned professions. In every community they are or ought to be its highest ornaments; in fact, pillars in holding up the most sacred interests of society. But culture, we maintain, is an interest that is higher, because more general and universal, than these specialties. It is certainly something grand to be a merchant prince, an engineer, a skilful physician, an advocate of right and justice against wrong and oppression in the community or State; and it is something still grander to be the messenger of glad tidings to men ground down in the chains of ignorance and sin; but, as we take it, it is something grander still to be a *man* in the proper sense of the term, to be a *man*, cultivated and ennobled, with a clear perception of his position in the universal system of things in which he stands as a living member, to be a Christian man with a clear consciousness of all his relations in time and of his im-

mortal destiny hereafter. Here the universal aspect of the case must be allowed to have the precedence over the particular or the specific. It is the natural, the necessary order. There is, however, no contradiction or antagonism; on the contrary, harmony, in which is found the only true solution of the great problem of life. To be a man in the proper sense of the term, cultivated, elevated and refined, is not at all antagonistic to the idea of an active and useful member of society. On the contrary, it is the life-ground, the foundation, the only true basis, on which every special activity of life should rest, in living union with which it is to be made to bloom and blossom as the rose. While therefore it is an animating thought to the teacher, that the students, with whom he meets from day to day in the recitation-room, are destined in a few years to occupy stations of honor and usefulness in the community, it is a still more animating thought, that he is giving them that general Christian culture, which will not only enable them to discharge their relative duties, but also adorn, beautify and ennoble society itself.

In consecutive lectures, Schelling goes on to show the relation of Philosophy to the various departments of Science, to Mathematics, to Physics, to Medicine, to Jurisprudence, and to Theology, and it is truly refreshing to see how these treadmills are elevated and ennobled when held up in all their ideal relations. But time will not allow us to trace them out, interesting and profitable as it might be, except in the case of Theology and Christianity. This must be done in every theory of education, else the whole subject is left floating in vague generality, and must lose all distinctness of character.

We have seen that all knowledge is organic, and that as a consequence all culture is also organic. We have seen what a free relation the particular branches sustain to the whole, and the whole to the particular. This can exist and be real only as the whole process proceeds from some definite origin, source, or principle. This, as we shall see, must be sought in Christianity. On this point, Schelling has given utterance to many profound and beautiful thoughts; not so much in the lectures

before us as in his later productions; and simple justice to his great name, as well as justice to the subject before us, requires that we should at least briefly refer to them.

It is sometimes said that he was the author of two systems of philosophy. The first he unfolded during his younger days with gigantic power of thought and concentration. This was regarded by some as nothing better than a refined system of pantheism. Then he became quiescent for almost a quarter of a century, during which he was in a manner forgotten and overshadowed by the illuminism of the Hegelian school, which became the rage throughout Germany. But many of the disciples of Hegel drove philosophy into the ground, and gave rise to wide-spread infidelity in the sphere of religion and Christianity. Under these circumstances, Schelling was searched out in his retreat, brought to Berlin, and placed on the cathedra, with the hope on the part of the friends of orthodoxy, that he would say something in favor of Christianity, and counteract in some way the baleful influence of Hegelian infidelity. This was an event which produced a sensation throughout Germany, much as political movements are wont to do in our own country. Without satisfying everybody, he acquitted himself in a noble style, like a Christian Plato, before the assembled University of Berlin, with eminent professors, jurists, and divines among his auditors. His services in bringing German philosophy back to Christianity, were similar to those of the great Schleiermacher in the department of Theology. He then unfolded what has been called his later system, which, it has been thought by some, cannot be reconciled with his previous views. He did not, however, think so himself. He regarded the first as simply negative, while the second was to be positive and supplementary to it; and he was accordingly unwilling to admit that there was any conflict between them. Simple justice to his memory requires that the one should be understood in the light of the other.

According to Schelling, Christianity is essentially *historical*, as opposed to the view which makes it to consist in a system of doctrines, dogmas, or morals. It is a divine revelation in the

sphere of history or the ideal world. The religion of the ancient Greeks was also a revelation, but one that was confined to the sphere of nature; here the infinite was shut up in finite forms, which themselves became deified, and polytheism was the natural result. The symbol became identified with the thought, which it was made to embody, and hence there could be no history or development in a religion of this kind; the only progress that was possible, consisted in the multiplication of gods and the increase of idolatrous worship. But it was quite otherwise with Christianity, a religion in which the infinite and eternal constituted the main thing; where the finite was thrown into the back ground, it was no longer adequate to represent the infinite even as a symbol, and was reduced to the subordinate position of a parable or allegory. Such a religion could not become objective in the fixed forms of nature, but in the progressive aspects of the ideal, human, historical world, in which the divine passes by each person, and must be embraced by faith, because it can no longer be held fast by the quiescent forms of the natural world. In order that such a religion may become a reality, it was necessary that the infinite and divine should enter the finite, not to deify it, but to impart to it life and activity, and to produce a reconciliation between the two worlds. The fundamental idea in Christianity, therefore, is the incarnation of the Son of God, which took place just when the ancient world was tending towards inevitable dissolution and was constrained to confess its own helplessness. Christ brought down in himself the infinite into the finite, and drew towards himself humanity not in its purity but in its fallen state. As an historical appearance, he passed back again into the spiritual world, and for himself substituted the Spirit, the active principle, which brings the finite into union with the infinite, and as such is the light of the modern world. Such a power introduced into the world's history cannot slumber in the forms, in which it is embodied, as in the old heathen systems of religion, but meeting with obstacles, obstructions, and contradictions in the natural world, which it has to surmount or destroy in order to bring about unity and reconciliation, it pro-

duces convulsions, and gives rise at times to such displays of divine power as constitute miracles, wonder works, or other revelations of the divine through the natural. History thus, by its connection with Christianity, assumes a new character, and becomes in some degree the symbol of the divine. But this is simply a light shining in a dark place, and it is necessary that the divine should be enshrined in a form commensurate with its purely ideal character. This it finds in the Christian Church, the highest form of history, a living work of art, which, while it embodies all the Christianity in the world, is the only means of revealing it to the world. Such a revelation of the divine in an historical form is something progressive, extending from one century to another, ever presenting the same mystery, but under different aspects, according to the position from which it is viewed. At one time its distinguishing character was Petrine, carrying with it the power of *law*, as we see it in the Catholic Church; then Pauline, in the Protestant Church, asserting the *freedom* of the Gospel, and finally it will be Johannean, in the Church of the Future, in which all contradictions will be reconciled under the gospel of *love*.

Thus spoke Schelling in an age, when philosophy ran mad, encouraged doubts in regard to the existence of the external world, and reduced Christianity to a system of empty notions or myths. Even in our days, when the Church is regarded at least as something, we have reason to thank him for his emphatic utterance, that "*Christianity is not doctrine, but fact, —history.*"

Under a profound conviction of the reality of Christianity as the most inward living force in history, Schelling had a profound contempt for the superficial rationalism of his day, and maintained that "*Christianity was everything or nothing.*" As the latter born of the dilemma was one that the most ordinary common sense must reject, he further maintained, especially in his later writings, that Christianity as a world-embracing fact, must be the "*middle point*" of all true philosophy, in connection, with which alone all other branches of knowledge can be viewed in their proper relation. "*The universe itself,*" he says,

"can be regarded as real history, as a moral kingdom, only in the light of Christianity, and only in union with it has it a true, fundamental character." Theology, the science of Christianity, therefore is the highest form of philosophy, after which follows the philosophy of nature and history in their regular natural order.

From this it will be seen, that, if culture is to be philosophical, it must also be Christian and theological; that it cannot claim to be philosophical, unless it is at the same time distinctively Christian and orthodox. Philosophy, as the universal science, might with as much consistency, ignore the world of mind or nature, as to set aside the moral order, which God Himself has established in our world, and then claim for itself the character of true wisdom.

Whether Schelling succeeded in making Christianity in all respects the central point of all philosophy and culture as he proposed to do, there is doubtless room for some divergency of opinion. It is, however, in fact, immaterial to us whether his system of thought shall be found in the end to harmonize fully with Christianity or not. What is most important as it regards the subject in hand is his testimony to the general fact or truth, which, coming from one in his position, from one who had traversed every department of knowledge, not superficially, but with profound earnestness, and had penetrated to the profoundest depths of science, was the highest achievement, which he could have made in the search after truth. In our days, when French philosophers, like Cousin, while professing to do all honor to Christianity, see nothing in it, but what is coordinate with other powers in history, it is something certainly to hear a great philosopher say that it is much more, that it is the grand synthesis or comprehension of all others combined in organic union. A wiser one than Schelling has said, that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. The life-penetrating relation between Christianity and all true culture, necessarily brings the school into right relation to other forms of life, the family, the State, and the Church. These are, so to speak, independent organs of activity, but they are all

intended to work harmoniously together for the same general result, the elevation and glorification of the race. The progress from the family to the school, from the school to the State, and Church on earth to the Church above, is all one and the same.

The idea of education, which is here advocated, is, of course, German, and is realized to a greater extent in the German university than it is anywhere else. Can it be realized in such a practical country as our own? Certainly not, unless it can find somewhere among us a favorable soil. As an exotic, with nothing in our state of society to appropriate it, it must fail if the attempt be made to introduce it. Institutions and Schools of learning that spring up among us naturally partake of the character of the communities that originate them, and represent truthfully the character of their culture. Hence such a thing as a university in the German sense of the word would require at least considerable change of views and taste, in regard to the character of a higher education, in those who attempt to realize such idea.

The question then arises, can we expect any such change in our American life as will prepare the way for the kind of culture here advocated? There would doubtless be difficulties of no ordinary character, in our prevailingly practical character, in long-established prejudices, and perhaps also in our social and religious life. But, if the thing in itself would be beneficial, these difficulties ought not to be considered insurmountable. Indeed, if our good practical common sense could be brought to see that institutions imparting such a training as is given in a German university, would be an honor and a blessing to the country, there is no doubt but that the way would be speedily opened for their establishment. So it is in other things that are considered important and valuable. There is no nation on earth that is more open and free to transplant foreign ideas than we Americans, when it is believed that they can be turned to account. The misfortune with us all along has been, that we have been frequently too ready to embrace foreign ideas, and so have grasped the evil rather than the good

of foreign countries. With all our efforts to promote the cause of education, with the princely donations of government and private individuals, we have not a single institution in the country which is prepared to give the culture which is imparted at German universities. Some would say that we do not need it, as we have something better. But all this is simply whistling to keep our courage up, and it is practically denied by the scores of our educated men, who have been frequenting German universities, with the view of acquiring such a training as will more fully qualify them for stations of honor and usefulness in this country. When we consider our resources, and the characteristic energy of our people, which is appalled by no difficulties, it is indeed strange, when we reflect upon it, that, with our many schools of learning, admirable in their place, we have none that is in all respects qualified to take the place of a German university, and to afford its advantages.

But, whatever may be the practical difficulties in the state of society generally, as it regards the establishment of such institutions, they certainly ought not exist in the German dispersion in this country. The German communities are remarkable for the tenacity with which they hold on to their language, their customs, and, we may say, also, to the German spirit. Why should they not, then, consider it their vocation to realize the highest ideas of German culture and German life? Who should, we might ask, if they should not? Here is a work in which they may most appropriately engage with profit to themselves and their children, and with the guaranty that in this way, more perhaps than in any other, they would confer the greatest boon upon the country and their fellow men. It was in this way that the fatherland has become a blessing to the world at large. Divided politically, with no means to exert political influence, debarred to a great extent from the commerce of the world, and limited in its natural resources, by her schools and universities, her books and learned men, she is exerting at the present day a deeper, if not a wider influence on the history of the world, than England, with her commerce and wealth, or France, with her military and political influence.

So far as our own communion is concerned, it is well known

that American Germans have not been altogether untrue to their name and antecedents in their efforts to promote the interests of a higher education. Limited and contracted as we may say these have been, the spirit, the soul, the ideas of true culture, such as we have described it, has been energetically present among us for many years. Truly Christian and philosophical training has been aimed at and successfully maintained in our seminaries of learning. The views of the book we have been reviewing were the views of Rauch, the first President of Marshall College, and they have become the views of those who have followed him, whether as teachers or students. All this has been done against opposition from without, and still greater difficulties within, arising from the want of means and resources to make our institutions what they ought to be. To enable a school of learning to realize its idea, it must have all the means and appliances necessary to carry out its work. It must have libraries, apparatus, and it must have the men and the moral strength in its faculty to make it effective. In this respect our college, energetic and successful as it has been with its meagre resources, has not by any means been a favorite of fortune. Much of its history consists in its heroic and self-sacrificing efforts to maintain its existence, and to keep up appearances. It is gratifying, however, to know that there is a feeling abroad in the Church, that byegones should be byegones, and that the time has arrived, when more liberal things should be devised for its interests and efficiency. This, we think, ought to be encouraged. We have arrived at a juncture, when it is felt that the Church, or liberal men of wealth in our communion, should place our educational affairs on a vantage ground, and give our college at Lancaster an impulse, which would make it truly a power in the land. In no other way, perhaps, could we confer a greater blessing upon the country at large, the Church of Christ, or our own people. It may be truly said to be a golden opportunity, which it would be extremely unwise for us not to avail ourselves of. In this we would share the sympathy and prayers of all patriotic and Christian men. By faith and prayer the object can be accomplished.

ART. VII.—THE VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE CHURCH.

BY REV. D. GANE, D. D.

There are some who make this expression to mean two separate and independent things. Instead of regarding the visible and invisible as different sides of the same Church, they resolve them actually into two Churches. Hence you often hear them speak of a visible Church as something altogether whole and complete in itself; and in like manner also of an invisible Church as being finished and entire, as such, without any necessary relation to its visible form or manifestation. The error which is here committed should be palpable to every mind. It is the old dualistic sundering of what God has joined together—heretical to the core. It is the insidious heresy of the Bishop of Constantinople, of the 5th century, which first attacked the Person of Christ, and then, and as a consequence, the Church. Man also is visible and invisible; and it would manifestly be just as reasonable to say, that either one of these sides of his nature is complete and independent in itself; or that together they constitute, in fact, two men instead of one. The error has long since been theoretically driven from the field.

There are others, who think they are doing wonders in the way of combating the old heresy of dualism, when they acknowledge the existence of a relation between the visible and the invisible. It is clear, however, that this does not in the least relieve the case, as long as these two sides of the same thing are regarded as separately complete, each in and by itself. If they can be thus complete, then it still follows, whatever relation may be supposed to exist between them, that they constitute two Churches, and not one. Moreover, the relation itself, which, in these circumstances, is allowed to hold, or which is at all conceivable or possible, between the visible and the

invisible, never comes, nor can come in fact, to anything more than a mere outward and mechanical connection. The separate completeness of the two sides can admit of nothing deeper or more real. If this relation were regarded as inward and vital, it would at once induce the perception and actually constrain the conclusion, that neither aspect, thus related to the other, could be the whole; for in this case, the very necessity of such a union of the one with the other, would show its incompleteness in itself, and also demonstrate its essential dependence upon the other. There is, therefore, no escape from the heresy of dualism in any such superficial and mechanical view.

Plainly, the case requires the union of the visible and the invisible in a *vital* and *organic* form, in order to the completeness, not of two things, but of *one* and the *same thing*, namely, the Church of Christ. Just as man is not body, nor spirit, but body and spirit, and just as he is not both these in the form of separate completeness, but *vital* *united in one person*, so the visible and the invisible, *organically united*, form one Church. These are therefore the different sides only of one and the same thing. The *unity* is the essential element.

It is equally plain that the visible is the side towards man, and that the invisible is the side towards God. The same thing meets us in the ever glorious Person of Christ, and it is in this, especially, that we see His adaptation to our condition as Saviour. He is our Saviour by virtue of this fact. By His divinity He stands organically related to God, and by His Humanity He stands related in the same way to man, and *thus* He is our Mediator. This is the regulative law for the Church, which is His body. Man is concerned, first of all, with the side of the Church which is nearest to him, and farthest from God. God begins to move towards man through the invisible, which is next to Him; man begins to move towards God through the visible, which is next to him. God and man meet in the *union* of the two, which is the Christian Church in its true, whole, organic, and proper character. This is enough to show the fallacy as well as the folly of the idea, that we must first be members, somehow or another, of the invisible side of the Church before we

can be received into the visible. It is unnatural in every sense, and so far as man can see, an utter impossibility. We can find no divine objective means to accomplish such an end. God has never ordained such means. As well indeed, might a man, in taking a journey, try to start at the point where he hopes to end. The very reverse of this is the true order of procedure. We start from the point at which we are, and thus hope to reach the point at which we aim. We begin with the side of the Church which is towards us—the side which, on account of its visibility and tangible humanness, is adapted to us; and, taken up in this, we are led to the invisible, because of the vital relationship which holds between them in the objective constitution of the Church itself.

This truth, so clear in itself, has for its illustration the whole world of Nature so far as this has become known to us. In no department do we get to essences *directly*, but always indirectly, namely, through the outward forms and signs of essences. We know the invisible only as it is borne to us in the visible; and we reach it practically just in proportion as we penetrate the outward form which is nearest to us, and thus actually enter the organism, of whatever character it may be. We do not study the essence of a plant in order to understand its outward form and structure; we do not first seek to understand the soul of man, and then, by means of this knowledge, try to understand his body. Everybody knows that we always proceed, and are compelled to proceed just in the reverse order. So from the visible in the Church we pass to the invisible—from the outside, and the side which is next to us, we pass to the inside, and the side which is most remote from us, and nearest to God.

We all feel this even in the order of the words forming the caption of this article. Who would think of saying the *invisible and visible Church*? Every one feels that there is an awkwardness in such an arrangement, that it is unnatural. It is placing that first which proper order requires to be placed second. The *visible and invisible* is the order that meets our feelings, and which leads us to say it is right, although, intel-

lectually, we may be able to assign no definite reason for our feeling. It is the unconfused testimony of our deeper consciousness, through which the analogy of the world under all other forms, uniting with our experiences in all other departments, expresses itself. Here we have the kingdom of Nature teaching parabolically the order and constitution of the kingdom of Grace. From the known we rise to the unknown—from the visible to the invisible.

Still, as already seen, no mode of representing the case dare be allowed to involve a dualism. Words and phrases, here as well as elsewhere, must take their meaning or peculiar force, from the things to which they are applied. When we speak of reaching the invisible through the visible, we do not thereby mean, that the invisible is not *in* the visible, that it is not *one* with it, that it is something separate from, and lying beyond it. The Church is not visible *and* invisible, but a *union* of the two. The Church under this aspect is more than visibility simply added to invisibility in a mathematical way. Visibility + invisibility is not—the Church. The Church is the *union* of these two in the power of *one life*—one life indivisible by its very nature. This is vastly more than the two in juxtaposition. To allow of a sundering, or to admit of two separate values under any real form, even for one moment, is to allow at the same time of an utter destruction of the very being of the Church itself, just as you have physical death when the union of body and soul in man ceases. This union of the two sides was the ground of that old saying—“*Extra ecclesiam salus nulla;*” and of those other words no less venerable and weighty: “*Habere jam non potest Deum patrem, qui Ecclesiam non habet matrem.*” That which we *see* of the Church is, therefore, never mere form. Here is just the point at which so many seem to make shipwreck. An organic sign is never a sign only, but the embodiment also of the life of the organism in which it holds, and which it represents and proclaims. Such persons do not steadily hold the union of the visible and invisible, but take these as separable, or as existing each for itself, or at most as being merely mathematically *added* together, in such a way, that

the visible never actually, and in any necessary form, embodies and represents the invisible. What is this but down right Nestorianism over again in its very worst form? Hence it is difficult for such persons to conceive of real sacraments at all, either in the early or Reformation sense of the word; for in both these senses the sacraments, in their formal character, are regarded as holding vitally in the unseen essence of Christianity. Conceding the possibility of the invisible, in ordinances which Christ has appointed, being separated from the visible, it is not hard to regard all that appeals to the eye, and which God has thus made to come near to man, as merely *formal*. The doubt, thus started, necessarily tends this way. At least, where this possibility of separation is allowed to hold in any legitimate divine ordinance under its objective form, there can be no assured *confidence* for the spirit of their union at any time. Thus the ground of positive faith is broken up, the power of certitude is destroyed, the testimony of sacraments is entirely lost, and everything touching the Church is rendered uncertain, shadowy, and unreal. In this way man is sent into the endless confusion of his own subjective nature for the evidence of the presence of the unseen, which he would otherwise find in the holy sacraments, and which our Catechism plainly teaches us to look for in them. Ques. 73.

But at this age, it is felt by most men that this dualistic theory involves entirely too much, and that unless it be effectually checked by some means, it will prove fatal to the whole practical interest of Christianity. It is evident to most minds, that neither the visible nor the invisible, separately taken, constitutes the Church of Christ, and that to regard either of them, as such, is a most hurtful delusion. Here is the prolific source of dead formality on the one hand, and of the wildest forms of fanaticism on the other. If the visible *can be* where the invisible *is not*, *there* you have not the Church; or if the invisible *can be*, normally, and for the practical purposes of salvation, where the visible *is not*, *there*, again, you have not the Church, but "some other way" of deliverance; for the Church consists in the presence of these two sides united in the power of one

common life, and in this view is the object of faith according to the Creed. The invisible life of an organism is always in and pervasively commensurate with its sign or visible form. We believe there is no exception to the rule. Therefore, to conceive even the possibility of their separation, in the present application of the subject, much more so to regard this separation as at any time an actual fact, is virtually to deny the Church altogether. And this is evidently the result to which the cry of empty and vain formality, as touching any of God's legitimate ordinances, must come in the end. If the visible does not *embody* the invisible in a real way, then there is no actual Church of Christ in the world, just as, if the body does not in like manner enshrine the soul, there is no actual man in the world. There may be a visible *and* an invisible—there may be a body *and* a soul, but the two not vitally *in* each other and forming one life, there is no Church—there is no man.

But if these two things *are* one, and *must be* one to meet the demands of the case itself, then why speak of a visible and invisible Church? Why speak of empty forms and vain ceremonials? Why speak of "water baptism" as distinguished from the "baptism of the Holy Ghost" (two baptisms and both divinely appointed!)? Why speak of the Holy Supper as bearing no grace, and the necessity of feeding upon Christ in some other way? Why all those pious warnings against trusting in God through the ordinances, which he has ordained, as if they were all so many mere deceptive signs and cheats? Would there be room at all for any such language, if it were steadily believed, that the visible and invisible are one in the deep, organic and sacramental sense of the word—making but one Church, one baptism, one eucharist? In this view it would be felt that, as physical eating is, because of its being outward, formal and in the flesh, no mere vain formality in which the spirit has no actual interest, so the formal act of baptism, and the outward eating of the bread and drinking of the cup, the proper conditions being at hand, are not pure formalities which result in no gracious good, so far as "spiritual religion" in the soul may be concerned. Institutions are always the embodi-

ments of organic laws, and are therefore always essential to the life in which they stand. The institutions of grace (and pre-eminently so the Holy Sacraments) stand vitally in the *union* of these two sides of the Church's being, and, therefore, in themselves they must really embody what they represent and proclaim. *Man* may imagine functions to exist where there are no faculties, or set artificial eyes where there is no vision, and then trust to their guidance. This *would* be formality. No such mock appearances, however, can be attributed to the institutions which God creates. The visible and the invisible, necessarily being one in the Church of Christ, His body, there can be no room to conceive any organic part or function of it to be formal only. Every such part or function must, with its formality, be also a vitality.

ART. VIII.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

REPORT on the Prisons and Reformatories of the United States and Canada, made to the Legislature of New York, Jan. 1867. By *E. C. Wines, D.D., LL.D., and Theodore W. Dwight, LL.D. Albany: Van Benthuysen & Sons' Printing House, 1867.*

This Report of between 500 and 600 pages, is well worthy the attention of the American public, and especially of those who feel specially interested in the welfare of society. It has already called forth no little discussion in the leading periodicals of the country. The subject seems to be claiming special attention at this time, both in this country and in Europe.

Humanitarianism regards crime as an error and a misfortune;—only this and nothing more. Hence punishment looks only to the protection of society and the improvement of the offender. This theory contains a fundamental error, in overlooking the element of crime, and the necessary connection between guilt and penalty. There is something more than society to protect; the law must be vindicated. This is an eternal necessity. The criminal is punished first because the law requires it; and this requirement rests originally in the necessary relation between law and punishment. If it were perfectly certain that a criminal would never afterwards injure society, yet having committed a crime, the law would require his punishment. So also if it were certain that his punishment would

serve in no way to reform him, or do him good, yet his punishment would be none the less necessary and right. It is not the end of punishment to reform the criminal. This, we take it, is the fundamental position to be assumed by the State on the subject.

Yet it does not follow from this, that the good of society or of the criminal has nothing to do with punishment. It connects itself very intimately with such punishment, and in this view demands attention. "The science of punishment, the philosophy which investigates the treatment of criminals, holding the just balance between coercion and reformation, must have a profound interest for all lovers of the human race." The Report investigates the subject from this point of view. There is much in it to interest all who are concerned for the suppression of vice and the promotion of public morality.

OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT AND THE PROBLEMS OF THE FUTURE. By A. E. Kroeger.

A pamphlet of thirty pages. We do not know who Mr. Kroeger is, nor who publishes his article. We only know that it is above the usual style of speeches and articles on the subject of our government.

Self-consciousness requires a relation between a multiplicity of individuals. Each individual, as he claims for himself free moral self-determination, must recognize the same in others. Each individual has a right to *life*, that is, a right to the body as a whole, the body being in the sensuous world the rational being itself. Each individual must retain exclusive determination of his own body. No one has the right to compel a physical action not determined through the will. In other words, complete moral freedom is guaranteed to each individual in guaranteeing to him this right to life. He has the right of *liberty*, that is, freedom of bodily movement. Hence the meaning of the *habeas corpus*; the right of emigration, &c. The *pursuit of happiness* is the right of property to all the sensuous world. He is entitled to his share, either landed estates, or some branch of business, &c. His sphere of causality, no matter what that sphere is, is his property, as soon as it is recognized by his fellow-citizens.

"But an agreement of each with all, to respect each other's freedom, affords no security that the rights of each will be respected; on the contrary, it is based on the very supposition that each will not respect the rights of the other. Hence the necessity of a power to compel each person to respect that agreement; and hence, also, the necessity of entrusting this power to a third party." Here we get the idea of government. It is the most respectable statement, as contained in the pamphlet, of the idea of government as developed from a rationalistic standpoint. The account given in the pamphlet of the early growth of the nation towards its present form of govern-

ment is the best we know of, showing that the Puritans, least of all, started with our idea of freedom. "Freedom was not what the Puritans wanted, but authority-worship." Hence they persecuted the Quakers, and banished Roger Williams. An opposite spirit developed in the South, running, in some cases, to the extreme of utter lawlessness. Then we have the nature of our government as it finally came to be settled, through the struggle of the three representative theories of Henry, Hamilton, and Madison, a thorough discussion of the whole subject, winding up with the conclusion, that our government is proper and good, and as such, entitled to the confidence of the people, and that all we need is to complete and perfect it, according as its incompleteness and imperfection may be discovered. Only this and nothing more. The pamphlet is in double columns, and contains quite enough for a full elucidation of the subject.

But, with all its ability, it seems strange to us, that such a subject can be discussed, from beginning to end, without any reference to God, or His law. If we can start to reason on the basis of *self-consciousness*, can we not as well take in the equally patent fact of man's *God-consciousness*. Government is not an invention of man, but a divine institution. Not divine as given by express formal direction, which would require a revelation; but based on the authority of the divine law, as applied to man's social nature in his civil relations. We must get up to this before we can form a true theory of government. All human rights, after all, rest upon man's relation to a law which is above him, stands over him, but which he is to seek to make the law of his own reason and will. It is most important in our day, that the conception of government as of divine authority in this sense, should become general among the people.

THE ATONEMENT. By the *Rev. Archibald Alexander Hodge, D.D.* Prof. of Didactic, and Historical and Polemical Theology, in the Western Theological Seminary, at Allegheny, Pa. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

It was our intention to notice this book somewhat at length in the present number of the REVIEW, but we have been compelled to postpone carrying out this intention until the next number. Meantime we have a few words to say in regard to it in this place.

In one view it would seem that it need not arrest particular attention; for it merely enunciates and argues the extreme Calvinistic theory of the Atonement as it is taught in the Seminaries of the O. S. Presbyterian Church. As, however, this extreme view has been toned down considerably of late years in the pulpit teaching of that denomination, it seems like a new effort to hold the Church up to the line of the most rigid orthodoxy on this subject. In this view, it is intended to arrest particular attention on the part of the members of that denomination. It seeks, moreover, to prove to all other Churches, that this is the only orthodox theory on the subject,

and that it has been thus held and taught by the Church in all ages. It thus seeks to challenge the attention of the theological public generally. Accordingly it has already encountered opposition in various quarters. The Lutheran Church, as represented by the *Lutheran and Missionary*, answers it with vigor, and the *American Presbyterian* of Philadelphia, a New School organ we believe, dissent from its positions likewise.

The theory of the atonement which it enunciates is as abhorrent to us, as is to the author what he styles "the semi-pantheistic Monism of Schleiermacher (wonder if he can pronounce this name) and the American *Mercersburg Theology*," or that "Mercersburg Theology which has its roots in a pantheistic philosophy and a Romish religion." In this last reference the author quotes from Dr. J. W. Nevins (this name he does not know how to spell, and he would perhaps find as much difficulty in spelling out his thoughts).

1. The book advocates, as earnestly as though he had the Bible all confessedly with him, the outward, mechanical, theory of the imputation of Adam's sin to his descendants. God entered into a covenant with Adam, by the terms of which it was agreed, that the first man should stand as the representative of his race. When he sinned his sin was imputed, according to the terms of this covenant, to all his descendants. How these descendants become sinful is another question, and the author admits that in some way the generic unity of the race has something to do with the matter. "Without going the length of Realism, it appears probable that the divinely ordained representative and substitutionary constitution, alike of the probation in Adam and the redemption in Christ, is conditioned upon the generic unity of men as constituting a race propagated by generation." But after all, this generic unity is only a secondary matter. Man becomes guilty because God imputes to him the sin of Adam. Dr. Hodge thinks it is ridiculous to say, that Adam's sin is made ours by "an ordinary physiological law of generation." Is, then, generation only *physiological*? and has it nothing to do with man's psychic and pneumatic nature likewise? "The effort to prove man a sinner on this scheme ends in reducing sin to the category of transmissible physiological accidents, such as red hair or a prognathous skull." A profound view truly of the mysterious fact of human generation! Of course we do not believe at all, that the Bible teaches any thing like this Covenant of Works theory, nor the manner in which it is here taught man becomes sinful and guilty before God. Dr. Hodge will have to write a good deal more before he succeeds in showing, that the Bible and the Church do not teach Realism, in making Adam the generic head of the race. We doubt even whether he has led Dr. Shedd to see, that he is all wrong on this subject.

2. This book then goes on to explain that God now made another covenant with His Son, by which it was agreed that Christ should become a substitute for the sinner and suffer the penalty of sin in his

stead. God imputes our sin to Christ, and Christ suffers the penalty. When that is done God is satisfied, and frees the sinner from judgment. But inasmuch as all are not released from judgment, it must follow that the satisfaction could not have been made for all. The application of the atonement is just as broad as its provisions. Hence Christ did not die for all, as applying to the whole race, but only for the *all* of the elect! This is the doctrine which, we remarked above, the pulpit teaching of the Presbyterian Church has toned down. Their ministers do not preach generally, that Christ died, not for all men, but for only a part of the human family. Such a doctrine finds too much in the Bible against it. Hence it must be confined to Theological Seminaries, where a certain theory of *irresistible* grace is made logically to rule the whole system, whether it can carry the Scriptures with it or not. We do not believe that Dr. Hodge can prove that the Church in all the past has held this system, nor persuade the Church of the present to adopt it. It is far worse than the "semi-pantheistic Monism of Schleiermacher and the American Mercersburg Theology."

3. The theory of the application of the atonement now follows. A satisfaction having been made, the penalty paid, God now proceeds to apply its benefits to all who are entitled to it. Being freed from the penal consequences of sin, they must now be regenerated and sanctified. This is a new work which God performs in their behalf, without any necessary connection with the person of Christ. The author says in one place, p. 319, "We believe that God could have changed man's subjective moral condition by the direct action of his Holy Spirit upon the human soul, without an objective exhibition of his love by means of such a sacrifice as that made in the person of his Son." That is, the work of saving man in its subjective aspects, his regeneration and sanctification, his resurrection and glorification, this work does not stand in any necessary relation to Christ, except as He, by paying a certain penalty, made it morally possible consistently with the justice of God. We do not wonder that such a theology runs out into barren orthodoxy, and becomes a mere dry skeleton, abhorrent to all who have learned to look upon an *organism* in the full play of fresh, vigorous life. We would like to see Dr. Hodge's exegesis of John vii. 39.

No, we feel an abhorrence for this theory of the atonement. Dr. Hodge argues against the Governmental Theory, and the Moral Influence Theory, but we think this *Juridical Theory* of his is not a whit better. We think the *Generic-headship Theory* is better than they all. This, Mercersburg Theology, in common with the teachings of the Church in the past, and all the better theology of the present, firmly holds. It only needs to be stated in comparison with the other theories named, in order to see that it answers fully to the teachings of Holy Scripture, and goes far to remove the sore difficulties with which this subject is environed in its scientific explanation.

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL INDEX. By *R. G. Pardee, A. M.*, Philadelphia: J. C. Garrigues & Co., 148 South Fourth St., 1868.

A little volume of about 250 pages, gotten up in the very best style of the art. If the outward appearance is a recommendation of a book, the publishers have certainly given this volume the very best recommendation.

The author has also done his work well. This book sets forth the results of a faithful study of the Sunday-School system, and an experience of forty-five years. We say results, for he gives directions and conclusions, as the title indicates, without wearying the reader with the mental processes through which he passed in reaching the results. It is a most excellent guide, or hand-book for those who are engaged in the Sunday-School work. Thus much, and more, may be said commendatory of the book, judging it from the author's point of view. We are glad to find, also, that he seeks to place the Sunday-School in proper relation to the Church. "The Church of Christ is the grand centre and radiating point of all our Christian efforts." He pleads, too, for placing the Sunday-School under the guidance of pastors. This is right. A Sunday-School which seeks to carry on its operations independent of the pastor, assumes a position which must be condemned. And so, on the other hand, it is the duty of a pastor to see to it, that this important interest of the Congregation pass not out of his control. It is an institution whose powerful influence over the young of his flock he is under obligation to guide and direct.

At the same time our convictions require us to say, that we are not by any means satisfied, that the Sunday-School system, as it stands at present, rests on the proper basis. It is an existing institution of immense power, and it cannot, therefore, be ignored. A wise pastor will seek to turn it to the best possible account. Yet such Churches as seek to maintain a system of Catechisation, such as the Episcopalian, Lutheran, German Reformed, and (we ought to be able to add) the Presbyterian, must feel, that the Sunday-School by no means covers the ground, or answers the want of Catechetical instruction. It ignores teaching in the true catechetical sense, because it seeks to instruct from the Bible without the medium of Creed and Catechism. It ignores, to a large extent, the status of baptized members of the Church. It cannot, therefore, properly train the children of the Church with a view to Confirmation, which is the goal of Catechisation. It ignores the distinction between the baptized and the unbaptized. Without referring to other evils connected with the system, these are enough to lead such Churches as those referred to, to regard it as a system which needs close care and watching lest it prove disastrous to their best interests in this direction. It makes all the difference in the world in what light the children of the Church are regarded, and with what end they are religiously instructed. Hence those Churches which seek to maintain catecheti-

cal instruction, find no small difficulty in using the Sunday-School for their purpose. The only thing that can be done is to seek to make it the catechetical class of the congregation, so that the teaching of Scripture may be placed in proper relation to the Catechism. The fathers of the Reformed Church used to write as a motto on the Catechism, "*According to this rule, search the Scriptures.*"

One of the first things to which the Reformers turned their attention was, the preparation of Catechisms for family and congregational use in the religious instruction of the young. A Catechism is not a book to be laid on the shelf for occasional consultation by adult members on questions of orthodoxy, but it is to be constantly used in the instruction of the young. For these and other reasons that might be given at almost any length, we cannot but feel that a system, which tends to cultivate a spirit adverse to Catechisation in the churchly sense, is fraught with immense danger to the Church. We do not believe the Reformation Churches can ever be satisfied with the work of the Sunday-School as a substitution for the work of Catechisation in its broader or narrower sense.

A DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, Comprising its Antiquities, Biography, Geography and Natural History, with numerous illustrations and maps. Edited by *William Smith, LL. D.* Hartford: *J. B. Burr and Co.*, 1868.

This work in one volume, double columns, of over 700 pages, has just left the press. It is one of the best works of the kind with which we are acquainted. For those who have not access to any more extensive work, such as the *Encyclopedia*, it is of the highest interest. The Editor, who is Classical Examiner in the University of London, and Editor of the Dictionaries of "Greek and Roman Antiquities," "Biography," and "Geography," has called to his aid over seventy of the first theological writers of Europe and America. The larger work comprises three large octavo volumes of over three thousand double-columned pages in small type. The present is an abridgment of that work. It is reduced to such dimensions as will place it more readily in Christian families. We commend it as one of the best works for families, as well as for all who are called to aid in teaching the Bible in any capacity.